

12521
A

PLEA

For the Late Accurate and Excellent

Mr. Baxter,

And those that Speak of the Sufferings of Christ as he does.

I N

ANSWER

T O

Mr. Lobb's Insinuated Charge of Socinianism against 'em, in his late Appeal to the Bishop of Worcester, and Dr. Edwards.

With a Preface directed to Persons of all Persuasions, to call 'em from Frivolous and Over-eager Contentions about Words, on all sides.

Ἀλλοθιγενὲς ἢ ἀγὰρ.

Non agimur Partis Studiosi———

L O N D O N: Printed for J. Lawrence,
at the Angel in the Poultry, 1699.

PLEASE

For the Ladies and Gentlemen

MR. BAXTER

And those who speak of the
things of Christ

AND

TO

the people of the Church of England
and the people of the Church of Scotland

With a Preface to the
Perfection of the Christian
Over the whole world
on all sides

By the Author of the
as the first of the

T O T H E
(Whether Dissenting, or Consenting)

Readers.

THough the Concealment of my Name might (perhaps) be some Security to me, supposing any one should be offended at the following Papers; yet have I not thereupon allow'd my self a Liberty (too commonly taken) to reflect upon and censure those, whose Sentiments are not the same with mine: I have indeed taken the Freedom to expose their Notions, as they deserve; but without reproaching those that hold 'em. There is scarce any thing more common, than for Persons to maintain such Principles, the necessary Consequences whereof they do abominate; but either through Ignorance, or Inadvertency, they discern 'em not: Many through weakness cannot, others for want of due attention do not apprehend the Connexion there is between 'em: In both which cases 'tis not allowable,

To the Readers.

nor have we allow'd our selves to charge such invidious Consequences upon em (which are not own'd, but especially which are disown'd by 'em); but to argue from 'em against their mistaken Principles, is what no one can reasonably disallow. — And this is what is Principally blam'd in our Accuser, That he has laid us under the Imputation of Socinianism, at least of Socinianizing (Crimes which we do from our very Souls detest!) Had he attempted to prove it, as a Consequence upon One or Other Principle advanc'd by us, we should very thankfully have accepted his Endeavours to undeceive us; but having so injuriously Reproach'd us, we are necessitated to Vindicate our selves; should we be silent under the Impeachment, we should too far participate in our Accuser's guilt: That same Law of God not permitting us to bear false Witness against our selves, which Obliges us not to do it against our Neighbour. But though from this very Consideration the general Design of these Papers be Justifiable, that is not enough; nor yet tho the management and manner of writing be so, too: That may be justifiable, that is not greatly useful or commendable: We have therefore endeavour'd that the ensuing Pages may do real service.

In order whereunto, we have not only avoided all unbecoming Reflections, upon any Person or Party, by reason of their differing Sentiments from us; but have also studiously declin'd all meer Logomachies, all Contentions about meer Words and Phrases, carefully distinguishing (upon every occasion) real from meerly Verbal Differences; and

To the Readers.

As to the latter, even where the Words have been less apt and Expressive, we have not thought them worthy of a Debate, being more solicitous to find out the Sense in which one or other Person uses them, than concern'd about Phrases or Expressions on one side or other. And were this one Rule more universally observ'd, how greatly would it contribute to the Ending most of our Controversies; not to make meer Phrases and forms of speaking, the matter of a dispute either way; but to allow every one the liberty of their own expression, provided they can but agree in sense.

'Tis hardly to be conceiv'd, of how pernicious Consequence this one thing has been, the making necessary what God has never made so: should we take the freedom to instance in Self-devis'd Notions, and Ceremonies (some, as amongst the Papists, wicked and intolerable; others, almost amongst all other Persuasions that profess Christianity, needless, and (at the best) but tolerable) which yet have been impos'd with like rigour as if all Religion had lain in 'em; how black and dismal a Tragedy would it introduce! how great a part of that Christian blood, which has been spilt, would be found chargeable here-upon! But I shall confine my self to the Point before us, the insisting upon Terms and Phrases (such as are meerly of Humane Stamp,) as if so Necessary that Orthodoxy in the Faith, that Christianity itself could not subsist without 'em.

Such a Spirit as this has long been growing upon the Church; and in our Accuser it seems to have arriv'd to full Maturity: His whole Zeal and

To the Readers.

Strength and Time is, in a manner, taken up in Collecting, and heaping together, out of various Authors, certain words, and forms of speaking (without any fix'd determinate sense); and (though they have no certain meaning) the man will needs force some upon us, that we must by no means leave out, unless we will fall under his Resentments; and another set of Phrases, we may not use (let our sense be what it will) but, by vertue of I know not what (Papal or Patriarchal) Authority, he will say, we do Socinianize.

At this rate of magisterialness does he talk, in the Preface to his Appeal, p. 3. "If any one that comes after shall use the same Expressions (meaning, the same that Mr. Baxter uses)——" "I say (and who then dare gain-say it?) He does Socinianize! And immediately after (Speaking of such words, as He with others shall put into your Theses) he adds, much less may I be censur'd, though I express my Resentments against him, whosoever he be, that is for leaving such words out. One would have thought it had been no excess of modesty, if he had, at least, excepted his Superiours in State, Age, Gravity, Learning and Piety: If the King should Convene an Assembly of the most Pious and Judicious Bishops and others, to draw up Theses to avoid Socinianism and Arminianism, and they should leave out such Words, as this Dictator would put in, they are like (for what I see) to feel his Resentments, whosoever they be, without exception; though those worthy Persons, to whom he has Appeal'd, should be amongst 'em, they

To the Readers.

they are to find no favour; nay, though the King Himself should preside in the Assembly, the Beams of Majesty will not be a sufficient Security to Him.

In the mean time, it is to be observ'd, what a mighty stress this man lays upon Words and Expressions; these are all he talks of; not one Syllable about the sense or meaning of 'em: Men may mean what they will, so they do but use his Phrases; and let their meaning be never so sound, they must not escape his Censure, unless they speak his Words. What degree of Necessity be puts upon 'em, as well as what the particular Words and Phrases are that he would impose, may, the better appear if we also cast our eye upon the Letter he prefix'd to his late Defence: there we are told, " that the Phrases are those, " that they of the greatest Character for Learning——have both us'd, and judg'd necessary——not only as a fence about the receiv'd " Faith, and a Barrier against Irruptions upon " common Christianity: but as such Phrases, without which the Doctrines of Christ's Satisfaction, and of our Justification could neither be Orthodoxly, nor Intelligibly express'd.

You see 'tis not enough, that He may use 'em himself, but they must be impos'd as Necessary: Nor is he satisfi'd, to have his Words accounted a Fence about the receiv'd Faith, a Barrier against Irruptions upon common Christianity; but they must be admitted as the standard of Orthodoxy: Nothing will serve the turn, but they must be esteem'd Necessary, so Necessary, as that without them the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction,

To the Readers.

and of our *Justification* can neither be *Orthodoxly*, nor *Intelligibly* express'd. And what these so *invaluable* Phrases are, he tells us afterwards in his Defence it self, p. 13. & passim. They are the very same that run through his Appeal, viz. a *Commutation*, or change of Persons between *Christ* and us; *Christ's* sustaining the Person of *Sinners*, and *Suffering* in their Person; His coming under the *Bond* and *Obligation* of the *Violated Law*, &c. These Forms of Speaking are not, by any means, to be omitted; we forfeit our Understandings, our *Orthodoxy*, our *Christianity*, if we dare to alter 'em.

And (perhaps) all the guilt of this kind does not lie at the Door of this Accuser, and others of his way; it were well, if there were not a *Participation* of it on all sides: And therefore, as one earnestly desirous of the more *Healthy* and *Peaceful* State of the Church amongst us, I will here adventure to lay my Hand upon the *Contenders* of all *Denominations*; and whether they will bear, or whether they will forbear, I will (at least, so far as relates to the Matter in hand) interpose a few *Seasonable* and *Healing* Advices.

1. Distinguish carefully betwixt such Words or Terms as the Spirit of GOD has made use of, and such as are of our own devising.

2. As to the latter, distinguish again betwixt *Obscure* and *Improper* Terms, and such as are *Apt* and *Expressive* of what is intended by 'em.

3. Di-

To the Readers.

3. Distinguish betwixt what you are oblig'd to use your selves, and what you may expect from others.

4. As to others, you will find a difference (which shou'd be allow'd for) betwixt such as are asked for one or other Party, by Ignorance or Prepossession, and Men of more large and free Understandings.

5. But especially (as to the Expressions of other Men) distinguish betwixt what they Say, and what they Mean.

Whereupon I add,

(1.) It should be no Matter of Debate amongst Christians, Whether Scriptural, or other Terms, be to be preferr'd; the very Words of Scripture being Sacred, as well as the Sense. Though this will not altogether hold true, as to one or other Translation; yet of the Original Text, it is most certainly true, the very Words being Dictated by the Divine Spirit. And this (perhaps) is what principally distinguishes it from the best of other Writings: And even as to Translations themselves, by how much the nearer they approach (in their respective Languages) to the Original Text, and by how much the more exactly they express that, so much the greater regard is to be had to the very Words that are found in 'em. Thus far it may be hop'd, such as are Christians will readily be agreed. I say not this to Countenance any in their Ignorant Mis-applications of Scripture-Phrases; I would
only

To the Readers.

only have it to refer to an Understanding, and Apposite Use of 'em.

(2.) As to merely Humane Phrases, or Forms of Speaking, there are none (upon any pretence) fit to be impos'd; the most plausible Pretences commonly made use of, for that purpose, are either on one side, [Our Phrases are of Venerable Age, what the Church has long been in possession of]: Or, (perhaps) on the other side [Our Terms, though New, are most Clear and Expressive of the Truth, and render it easily Intelligible to every considering Mind]: Now, granting either the one or the other to be true, or (in some Instances) that they are both Old and Significant; yet all that can follow thereupon is, Therefore they are fit to be us'd; not, therefore they may, or ought to be impos'd. How weak would such a Method of Reasoning as this be, Such a Word the Ancients us'd, therefore we must use no other; such a Father, or such an Eminent Reformer us'd it, and therefore he is a Heretick, or a Man of very dangerous Principles, that varies from it! Or again, should it be admitted on the other Hand; [Such a Word is very significant, therefore no other should be us'd]! Yet upon no better bottom do Multitudes suffer the Churches Peace, and their own Charity to be reason'd away.

(3.) When we either speak, or write our selves, we are oblig'd to make use of such Terms as have a most clear and agreed Sense, and are best adapted to express to others, what it is we mean: the very end of Speech it self proves this. And hereupon

To the Readers.

we ought, out of how great Variety *soever* offers, to choose the fittest for our own use; but we are not hereupon impower'd to choose for, or prescribe to others, [In these Words, and no other, shall Ye Pray to GOD, or Speak to Men, &c.] Those seem fittest to one Person, which do not so to another.

(4.) Amongst Men that do not Religiously tie up themselves to the Phrases of one or other Party (but, placing their Christianity only in those Great and Necessary Things about which all Parties of Professors are agreed, as to other Matters, have a greater Latitude and Freedom, both of Thought and Speech) we may indeed expect the last mention'd Rule will be observ'd: But we should not wonder, if some do Tenaciously adhere to the Terms and Modes of Expression, that are peculiar to their own Party, how Obscure and Improper *soever*; some out of Weakness cannot, and many out of Prejudice and Prepossession will not vary from 'em.

(5.) Now even as to these, there is room to hope (at least), they may not mean altogether so bad, as their Words would seem to import: we should therefore (in such cases) do what in us lies, to find out the sound Sense they aim at, and approve of that, though not of their uncouth, and unintelligible Phrases. But,

(6.) By no means seek to impose upon others, one or other self-devised Phrase, or Form of Expression, as if Truth could not be maintain'd without it; neither lay so great a stress upon meer Words, as if Orthodoxy or Heresie did depend upon 'em. And surely

To the Readers.

we should have little disposition so successfully to cry up, and contend for our respective modes and forms of speaking, if we did consider,

I. What a trifling Spirit it argues, wherever it has place! a Mind empty of every thing that is more great and manly! a childish Spirit that can find leisure for, and pleasure in such little, inconsiderable things!

II. Especially, if we also add, (and I pray let it be added) How disagreeable it is, to a Spirit rightly Christian! and that on many accounts: particularly,

I. As it manifests too little Veneration for the sacred Scriptures; how boldly are these impeach'd of insufficiency, when Words and Phrases not to be met with here, are obtruded upon the Church as Necessary, so Necessary as that without them, the most important Articles of the Christian Faith can neither be Orthodoxly nor Intelligibly express'd. With modest minds it should surely suffice to say [they are apt, and may be useful]: but if their Necessity be press'd upon us, they are at least equaliz'd with, if not preferr'd to those of the Divine Spirit. And can any one that has the Spirit of Christianity in him, deliberately agree to this [my words, my Phrases are as Necessary as those the Holy Ghost has chosen]? He knew not how to convey his sense to the World so well as I! If any will thus insolently set up themselves and traduce the sacred Oracles of our holy Religion, my Soul, come not thou into their secret!

To the Readers.

2. Nor will Christianity suffer, that the Perogative of God should be thus invaded: his Sovereign Rights are hereby usur'd upon: forasmuch as it is one of his Peculiarities, to impose any thing upon the Church as Necessary. He claims it, as what belongs to him; not only to be a Law-giver, but to be the one, the only Lawgiver in reference hereto: and who are we, that we should juggle him out of his Throne.

3. How disagreeing to the Spirit of Christianity is it, to give way to and countenance such uncharitable censures; [that such an one is unsound, Heretical, no Christian; because he dos not use my Words.] How common a guilt is this! And by how much the more lately such an Over-magnifi'd Phrase was introduc'd, so much the farther does the censure reach: For Instance, Christ's Suffering in our Person, &c. If no one may be allow'd for Orthodox, that uses not this Phrase; the whole Christian Church is laid under Censure, except an inconsiderable handful within this last Age. But can it consist with Christianity (whereof Charity is a most Essential and inseparable part) to reproach, and unchristianize (in a manner) the whole Christian Church? Besides,

4. We do not only hereby revile Christians, (and so offend against the Generation of God's children); but we do also debase Christianity it self: how contemptibly mean, and vile is it render'd in the eyes of By-standers, when they see us with so unproportionate heat and Zeal contend for and against insignificant words and Phrases; and labouring to proselite men

To the Readers.

to these, as if the Kingdom of God was in these Letters and Syllables: How do they hereupon ridicule, and break their Prophane Jest upon Our Holy Profession! and how are they fix'd in their Prejudices against it! And is it nothing to us, that the Name of Christ, and Christianity, is Blasphem'd through us, by our means.

5. Besides, How are we hereby diverted, our Minds diverted from intending the most amazingly great and awful Things that relate to Christianity: Those Principles and Practices that do most truly Essentiate and Constitute it: Those Truths which are according to Godliness, and which are adapted to advance and promote it; which do both tend to make the Temper of our own Spirits better, and to excite us to do more good to Others. These are forgotten, and overlook'd: hereupon (being diverted from what should Animate and Nourish us) what a Ghastliness and Languor appears in the Face of Our Profession! How are we become as dead Men! How little of the Life and Power of Godliness is to be found amongst us! And should not this (will it not) be laid to Heart by such as have any serious Regard to the Welfare of Christianity, or of their own Souls? Will it not henceforward render Strifes of Words less Grateful and Relishing to such, that they are likely to be attended with so pernicious Effects. We cannot surely deliberately consent, that One or Other Phrase should be to us instead of our God, our Redeemer, our Faith, our Hope, our Love, Holiness, and our Heaven; nor place out the Zeal on that, which should be reserv'd for these.

But

To the Readers.

But again,

III. If this Spirit were not so disagreeing to Christianity; is no way fit to be indulg'd, on the account of those perpetual Quarrels, it must necessarily introduce amongst us: It would endlessly be Contested (without the possibility of being ever decided) what particular Phrases shall be admitted as necessary? By what Rules their Necessity, or no-Necessity shall be adjusted? Or, with whom the Judgment of this grand Affair shall be entrusted?

And IV. It would greatly tend (should it obtain) to discourage all Improvements in Knowledge: Every encrease of Light will require more or less Alteration to be made in the old and customary Modes of Expression; and consequently endanger a Person's Reputation. At how much easier Cost, may Men learn a set of Phrases, that they do not understand; and save their Pains, and their Orthodoxy at once.

V. And Lastly, It has not the least Advantage attending it, to compensate for, and set against all its mischievous Effects. That which is commonly pretended for it, is, that it may be a Security against Error. But how utterly insufficient is it for any such Purpose! How possible, nay, how common a Case is it, for Persons to use the same Phrase, and yet not mean the same thing. So vain, and so Pernicious does it generally prove, when we leave the Methods God has prescrib'd, and will needs prevent or remove the Churches Maladies by Ways and Means of our own devising.

But

To the Readers.

But to draw to a Close, there is one thing farther that I would add (to avoid Offence) and 'tis in Reference to the mention of Mr. Cross's Name, in the long Marginal Note: When I wrote what you find there, I was in hopes of his second Thoughts upon that Text; and the Papers were out of my Hand sometime before I heard of his Death (I not having seen 'em for several Months past): Nor, till I saw it in Print, did I remember there was any thing in which he was concern'd; otherwise I should at least have suppress'd his Name, if not all that relates to him — for I cannot but be averse to every thing that looks like trampling upon the Ashes of the Dead.

ERRATA.

Page 3. l. 26. r. *nostra*, p. 19. l. 8. r. as *Errors*, p. 20. l. 16. r. *alledge*, p. 28. l. 26. r. *surely*, p. 45. l. 2. r. *that*, p. 75. l. 14. r. *Strick-*
us, p. 92. l. 2. add *it*, p. 114. l. 4. r. *pursuing*.

~~That which is apprehended more easily to require that this invidious Resolution be taken notice of, than this way the Resolution of that most excellent Person his Majesty, and his most valuable Writings as well as the Ministry of those that in this~~

Introduction.

NOt knowing whether that Right Reverend and Worthy Bishop, or the other very Learned Person (in the great and constant Cares of a more publick Nature that attend their Stations) may not account it rudeness for us to break in upon and disturb 'em with our petty Quarrels; I have not thought fit so directly to apply to them; and for this only Reason it is, that I have not joynd in the Appeal to 'em. Their Determination is not hereby intended to be declin'd; there being no Reason to fear the Issue should they think fit to publish their Judgments to the World.

But whether their leisure from greater Affairs will permit 'em (or indeed, whether they shall account it worth their leisure) to interpose in this Matter, or not; the Nature of the Charge is such, that (how groundlessly soever it be advanc'd) it is not fit to be silent under it.

That which is apprehended more especially to require that this invidious Reflection be taken notice of, is, That this way the Reputation of that most excellent Person is undermin'd, and his most valuable Writings (as well as the Ministry of those that in this Matter are of his Judgment) are (so far as is in the Accuser's Power) blasted, and rendered odious and useless. And such as either have wanted opportunity to look into the *Socinian* Writings, or have not Judgment sufficient to distinguish betwixt Appearances and Realities, may be so far impos'd upon, by the Confidence of this Accuser, as to believe the Charge advanc'd against us.

For their sakes therefore, and our own; to prevent their Guilt, as well as to preserve our own Reputation and Usefulness (and, if possible, also to undeceive this Accuser and his Brethren) we think it fit and necessary that it be made appear, There is no sufficient ground whereupon to Censure Mr. Baxter, or (those whom he calls) his Followers, as *Socinians*, in that Great and Important Article of Christ's Satisfaction.

For the clearing whereof, we shall, with reference to the suspected Passages, (First) manifest their Agreeableness to Truth. And then shew the no-advantage hereby given to the *Socinian* Cause.

Now the Passages this Accuser, and his Brethren, are so much afraid of, and griev'd at (as he pretends) we shall set together, that

that we may see what they will in the whole amount to; and they are these:

1. *Christi perpeſſiones quoad rationem vel ſuere malum naturale perpeſſum ex occaſione & cauſalitate reſpectu peccatorum generis humani.* (He ſhould have added) *& proxime ex ſponſione & conſenſus proprii obligatione.* Bar. Method. Theol. Pars III. Cap. 1. Determin. 3. p. 38. This will be the better underſtood, if it be obſerv'd, that the Queſtion he had before him, was, *Whether the Suffering of Chriſt was properly and formally a Punishment.* For the Determination whereof, he does define *Punishment* (properly ſo call'd) a *Natural Evil* (that is, an Evil of Suffering) *inflicted for, or on account of a Moral Evil* (i. e. the Evil of Sin.) And (beſides other Diſtinctions which he had premiſſed) he diſtinguiſhes betwixt the Suffering of the *Delinquent* himſelf, for his own Sin, in which caſe his Sin is *directly, immediately, and per ſe*, the cauſe of his Suffering; and this (he tells us) is *Punishment* in the Primary and moſt Famous Senſe of it: and the Suffering of another by reaſon of the Delinquent's fault: in which caſe, though there be a Suffering for Sin, yet that Sin is more *indirectly, mediately, and per accidens* the cauſe of the Suffering; and therefore though it be Punishment, yet 'tis only in a Secondary and Analogical Senſe to be ſo call'd.

And this Secondary sort of *Punishment* is two-fold; 'tis either *Natural* or *Voluntary*; the *Natural* Punishment for another's Sin, he calls that which follows upon the nearness of Relation in Nature betwixt the Sufferer and the Sinner; as when Children suffer for their Parent's Sins; the *Voluntary* is, when there is a free consent and undertaking to suffer on the behalf, and in the stead of the Sinner, though there was no previous Relation to the Sinner from whence he should naturally be oblig'd to suffer for him.

Now he does (and surely with very just Reason) conclude the Sufferings of Christ to be of this last kind, for that they were not the Sufferings of the Delinquent himself, and so not Punishment in the Primary and most famous Sense of the Word; they could therefore only be *Punishment* in a Secondary and less proper Sense. And since, even in his Assuming our Nature, Christ was conceiv'd miraculously by the Power of the Holy Ghost (and did not descend from *Adam* by ordinary Generation) therefore in that Secondary Sense, his Punishment could not be the natural Effect of *Adam's* Sin. It remains then, that Christ only was punish'd as a *Voluntary Undertaker*, and the Analogical Punishment He underwent was inflicted on him as a *Sponsor* in our stead; our Sins were the ground and reason of his Sufferings, yea the

the meritorious Cause (but not so nearly and immediately as they wou'd have been of our own Sufferings;) for that his Sponſion and Conſent did neceſſarily intervene; ſo that they may not unaptly be call'd Puniſhments, though not ſo fully and properly as the Sufferings of the Sinners themſelves might have been ſo call'd. To this Senſe does that excellent Perſon ſpeak, and this is little elſe than a Tranſlation of his *Latine* Words, as will appear to any one that is capable and willing to conſult the place refer'd to. And this being the Subſtance of what he afterwards quotes from him, I ſhall need to be at no farther trouble than only to recite the Words.

12. And thus he goes on; *Peccata noſtra fuere cauſa remota paſſionis Chriſti.* And again, *Culpa noſtra non erat cauſa proxima ejus paſſionis, ſed tantum remota & occaſio.* Once more; *ſi ſenſu improprio* (i. e. not in that moſt proper and primary Senſe in which they are imputed to the Sinner himſelf, as may be collected from the immediately fore-going Words) *per magnam connotationem dici poteſt, peccata noſtro Chriſto imputata fuiſſe, viz. quoad reationem pene (& culpa ut ad penam, at non in ſe) idq; tantum remote: non quaſi peccata noſtra penas Chriſti merita eſſent; ſed quia niſi nobis penas merita eſſent, ille penas non dediſſet. Et quia pena nulla eſt formaliter niſi propter peccatum, ideo*

hanc Christ passionem fuisse penam analogicam
 pro illa, peccatum (non suum, sed nostrum;
 non causam meritoriam, sed quasi pro causam
 meritariam & occasionem) commutabant. Ibid.
 Deum. 1. p. 40, 41.

He quotes him again in English, thus:
 "Man's Sin was an occasion of Christ's Suf-
 "ferings, as being *Loco causae meritoriae*,
 "for properly there was no meritorious
 "Cause. The Law's Curse, or Obligation,
 "was another occasion, as being *Miseria*
 "causa remouenda. Christ's voluntary Spon-
 "sion or Consent, was the moral obliging
 "Cause. *Universal Redempt.* p. 7. Again,
 "We must distinguish betwixt Suffering
 "Ex obligatione legis, & merito peccati, as
 "we should have done if we had suffered
 "our selves; and Suffering ex obligatione
 "solum sponsionis propriae, as Christ did,
 "without any Merit, or Legal Obligation,
 "his own Sponson being instead of both,
 "and our Sin and Obligation being but the
 "occasion, or *Loco causae meritoriae*, Ibid.
 "p. 25. Again, The Law, as binding us
 "was the great occasion of Christ's Death,
 "and *Loco causae obligatoriae*; but not the
 "obligatory Cause it self: Christ's own
 "Sponson, and his Father's Will, were the
 "only proper Obligations, P. 34. Again,
 "Christ did not suffer from the Obligation
 "of the Law, but from the Obligation of
 "his own Sponson, on occasion of the Law's
 "obliging

" obliging us to suffer, P. 48. Once more,
 " Christ's Sufferings had no real, proper,
 " meritorious Cause; but yet Man's Sins
 " were the *causa meritoria*, he under-
 " took to bear that Suffering which for aught
 " was due to us (not to Him) and there-
 " fore when I say, He bore the Sufferings
 " due to us, I mean it *materialiter* only,
 " such Sufferings for kind and weight He
 " bore, but his Obligation to bear 'em was
 " only from his own Spontaneity, and not the
 " Law, P. 91.

These are allodg'd by the Accuser, as
 some of those Passages which move him and
 his Brethren to fear, &c. *Specul.* P. 4. But
 these being but *some of 'em*, he adds the rest,
 P. 10. 11, 12. and what he further transcribes
 is this:

4. " We must not say that Christ died
 " *nostro loco*, so as to Personate us, or re-
 " present our Persons in Law-Sense, but
 " only to bear what else we must have borne,
 " P. 51. And, As for your Objection, That
 " no other way but Representing our Per-
 " sons cou'd suffice to save us by the Satis-
 " faction of another, 'tis a gross Mistake,
 " and naked Affirmation, without Proof:
 " And for them that say, Christ suffer'd in
 " *persona nostra*, but not satisfy'd, or mari-
 " ted so: I Answer, They speak Incon-
 " sistencies, B. 76. To which he adds his

" Application of that Phrase of Christ's
 " Suffering *pro nobis*; as it signifies, Suf-
 " fering that which another was oblig'd to
 " suffer towards the freeing him from it;
 " being *materially* the same; but not *for-*
 " *mally*, from the same Obligation, but from
 " the Obligation of a voluntary Sponson;
 " and this not in the Name, or as re-
 " presenting the Person of that other, but
 " in a Third Person, *viz.* in the Person of
 " a Mediator, Redeemer, or Friend, P. 22.
 23. I need not mention what he next adds,
 for that it were exceeding strange if any
 one shou'd (with this Author) Traduce a
 Person as Socinianizing, for distinguishing
 betwixt Christ's dying in our stead, and his
 dying for our good.

Now to what purpose have we all these
 Passages Transcrib'd by him? with what
 design? what, can it be imagin'd the Man
 will make of 'em! (unless he have a mind to
 bring some of his Friends into a better Ac-
 quaintance with that most excellent Per-
 son.) What has he to except against any
 of the Recited Clauses? For my part, I
 was not able to guess, what Evil it was
 that he wou'd charge upon 'em; nor cou'd
 I have been more surpriz'd, if any one had
 Cavill'd against the plainest Theorem in
Euclid; Mr. *Baxter's Theses* in this Case,
 being as plainly demonstrable (upon Scrip-
 ture-Principles) as any of *Euclid's* are
 (upon

(upon Principles of Common Reason:) nor is it fit (perhaps) that any thing shou'd be admitted into the rank of *Christian Doctrines*, but what is so. But what dangerous, what pernicious Error has he found in these Passages? Why, he dreams at least, that he is aware of a *Design* (bad enough, you may be sure) *against the Doctrine of a real, full, and proper Satisfaction to God's Justice for our Sins*, P. 4. *Risum teneatis*. Well, but how must this *Design* be carried on? Why, don't you observe it, here's left out a *Change of Persons between Christ and us all along*? I'm well aware of it; and what then? Why, and then there's not a *Word of Christ's Sustaining our Person*, nor of *Christ's Suffering in the Person of Sinners*; and a *Design* there is on foot (I smell it at a distance) to turn [*Christ's Suffering in the Person of Sinners*] into [*his Suffering in the Person of a Mediator*]. Why surely, though one can't yet guess what hurt there should be in it, yet (if it be kept so very close, as this Man's way of Expression would intimate) one would be ready to suspect, there was some ill design in it; but (upon further Enquiry) it appears, there was no need of so great Cunning to find out that this was design'd; 'tis what Mr. Baxter proclaim'd openly (in the hearing of the whole World) near Forty Four Years ago; for thus he spake in his *Confession of Faith*, P. 152, 153. *Christ, as the publick Sponsor, did bear the Punishment*
deserv'd

deserv'd by the Sins of the World, and made to his Father a Satisfaction sufficient for the Sins of all: but this he did in the Person of a Mediator, that undertook to bear the Penalty, and not in the Person of the Elect, or of any particular Sinner, &c. Nor has he at any time since made a Secret of it; but upon every befitting occasion this has still been his constant Language. So in the Catechism, at the end of his Family-Book, P. 447. Christ suffer'd for our Sins, and in our stead, because it was to free us from Sufferings; but yet He suffer'd in the Person of a Mediator, who indeed is one that undertook to suffer in the Sinner's stead; but never was, nor consented to be esteem'd the Sinner himself. And a little farther; Christ suffer'd in our stead, but not as our Delegate, nor in our Name and Person properly, but as a voluntary Mediator, &c. — So also in his Treatise of Justifying Righteousness, Part I. P. 55. Christ suffer'd and obey'd in the Person of the Mediator, between G O D and Man, and as a Subject to the Law of Mediation, The like again, P. 24. as indeed frequently in that Book. So in his Meth. Theol. P. III. P. 42. Christus in Persona Mediatoris passus est — non in Persona — offendente. And in his Cath. Theol. Part II. P. 38. §. 41. Christ did not take upon Him strictly and properly the (Natural or Civil) Person of any Sinner, much less of all the Elect, or all Sinners, but the Person of a Mediator between God and Sinners. See also §. 43. And P. 66. §. 142.

He (God) judges Christ to have been the Spout for and Mediator, and in that Person to have done and suffer'd as He did; because it is true: but He judges Him not to have been the Legal Person of the Sinner, — because that is not true. It were almost endless to refer you to all the other places where he thus speaks — Now after all, is it not very pleasant, to have this Man come and whisper it (as if it had been some mighty Secret) That he was aware this great Man had a design to turn [Christ's suffering in the Person of Sinners] into [his suffering in the Person of a Mediator.] P. 12. If it be a Plot, 'tis surely a very innocent one, that he should carry it on (for so many Years) so openly, and in the view of all the World; 'twas what he never was ashamed to own; and what was known to be his Sense of the Matter (for ought I know) before this Infanter was born.

But to proceed, Suppose he was for Christ's Suffering in the Person of a Mediator, and not of Sinners, (as, though 'tis by this Accuser only hinted as a remote Design, yet we have (if that will do him any kindness) given him very full and plain Evidence of it) what hurt is there in it? What! why then Christ was never by Virtue of the Sanction of the Law oblig'd to suffer for us; that is, as he oft tells us, the Original Law, the Law which we had transgressed did not oblige Christ to suffer.

suffer. Well, 'tis granted! pray go on;
 And then, *He suffer'd not a proper Punish-*
ment [but only the same Sufferings we were
oblig'd to materially, not formally.] This
 is the Design he (the Reporter) was aware of,
 and so suggested it, P. 12.

The Reporter (if all Reports be true)
 has been aware of other kind of Designs
 which yet he has not thought fit to suggest;
 and if he be so good at an Intrigue himself,
 as he is commonly sam'd to be, no wonder
 if he be jealous of every one else: It would
 incline one (that is of no very surmising
 Temper) to fear his Thoughts run much
 upon Designs and Plots when he is awake,
 that he cannot sleep but he must Dream of
 'em, and like one delirious cry out in his
 sleep, Oh! they have a Design, a Cursed
 Design, *I'm aware of what they aim at!*
 And when he is perfectly awake, he can
 tell of no more that they design, than only
 to turn [*Christ's suffering in the Person of Sin-*
ner,] into [*his suffering in the Person of a Me-*
diator] who was never by vertue of the Sanction
 of the Law, oblig'd to suffer for us, and who
 suffer'd not a proper Punishment, but only the
 same sufferings we were oblig'd to materially,
 and not formally; though in his Dream he
 had talk'd of a Design against the Doctrine of
 Satisfaction. — Whereas these two things
 do so widely differ, as that the one may be
 design'd, where the other is not, as shall
 hereafter

hereafter be made appear; yea, that 'tis as consistent, as for a most sincere *Anti-Socinian* to be as heartily engag'd against *Antinomianism*; and that nothing but his Ignorance can disprove this Accuser's being engag'd in a design to promote either the one or the other, *Socinianism*, I mean, or *Antinomianism*; though whether of the two may hereafter more evidently appear, if ever he should have either less Policy, or more Integrity than now.

In the mean time, as a Vindication of that (Not-without-just-veneration-to-be-Nam'd) Mr. *Baxter*, and those who (with my self) Bless God for him, and his Excellent Labours, (though we, as the Servants of Christ, dare follow no one farther than he is a Follower of our Lord;) I say, as a Vindication of him and our selves, I shall undertake these Two Things in the following Papers, *viz.* to prove, That what is here Transcrib'd from Mr. *Baxter* is the Truth, that must secure us from the Impious and to be abhorr'd Blasphemy of *Antinomianism*: And afterwards, to make it appear, That the equally horrid Opinions (on the *Socinian* Extream) are (not only not-countenanc'd, but also) most effectually refell'd upon these Principles.

To

To which I shall apply my self, when I have only added, That what is here said, is not intended as an Anticipation to the Just Defence that may be expected from that other worthy Person, whom this Accuser does also by Name traduce; and therefore I do not meddle with any of those Passages wherein he is personally concern'd.

P A R T I

THIS Accuser having through-
out his *Appeal* insinuated that
the before-recited Passages
are Unsound, and Socinianizing at least, if
not Socinian, has made it necessary in order
to our Defence, that we make it appear
they are not chargeable Errors, much less
as Socinianism. The former of these we
shall begin with, viz. That there is nothing
Erroneous or Unsound in the Particulars he
has Transcrib'd from Mr. Baxter.

§. 2. In order to which we shall con-
sider 'em distinctly, according to the several
Heads, to which he seems to have reduc'd
'em; tho' for want of Method in his Book
(or thro' the Intricacy of it at least) 'tis not
easie to find 'em out. But the Principles
he seems to Extract from the above-men-
tion'd Passages, and to expose to Censure are
these, viz.

I. That

I. That Christ Suffer'd by Vertue of the Law of Mediation, not by Vertue of the Sanction of the Violated Law.

II. And consequently that he Suffer'd in the Person of a Mediator, not in the Person of a Sinner.

III. And that thereupon his Sufferings were only *Materially*, not *Formally* the same we were oblig'd to.

IV. And that our Sin (tho' they were the Impulsive Meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings) yet it was only more *remotely* that they were so, and not so nearly and immediately as they wou'd have been of our own.

V. And therefore, though his Sufferings may not unaptly be call'd a *Punishment*, yet not in that full and proper Sense in which the Sufferings of the Sinner himself might have been so call'd.

CHAP. L

That Christ did not suffer by Vertue of the Law which we had Transgress'd, but only by Vertue of the Law of Mediation.

THIS is so far from being a pernicious Error, as that it is a very Important and most Useful Truth; for the manifest-
ing

ing which I'll set my self to hint the absurd Consequents of the opposite Notion, and to obviate the seeming Reasonings of this Accuser against it.

§. 1. Suppose we for a while that this Notion of Mr. *Baxter's* is false, as this Accuser would have it; now if it be so, then the Proposition contrary to it must needs be true; and if it were true, nothing but what is so could naturally and necessarily flow from it. We will therefore consider some of the direct Consequences of that opposite Notion, and they are such as these.

§. 2. 1. If Christ did suffer by vertue of the violated Law, then it must needs be, either that he was a Violator of the Law Himself, or that Law must be disjunctive; [*Thou, or thy Surety, shall obey, otherwise, Thou, or thy Surety, shall suffer.*] That one of these Consequents must be allow'd, cannot (with any appearance of Reason) be denied: He cou'd not suffer by vertue of that Law, unless He were under the reach of it; and how cou'd He be any other way under the reach of that Law, than one of these two:

Either as { Having violated it Himself; or,
being bound, when the Law was
given, as a Surety in the same
Bond with us.

There is indeed a third way pretended by this Accuser, and that is, *That by his own Sponſion, and by the will of the Father, He came under the Obligation of the Violated Law, and ſo ſtood bound by this Law to ſuffer, Ap. p. 5, 6.* But 'tis ſtrange, that a Perſon ſo well acquainted with Laws, as he wou'd be thought to be, ſhou'd need to be told, that if the Obligation Chriſt laid Himſelf under to ſuffer, was as exactly the ſame, with that we lay under, as it was poſſible to be; yet the Change that was made in the Perſon oblig'd to ſuffer, did alter the *Form* of it, and make it truly another Law, *another Obligation*, and not *that* of the Original Law, otherwiſe than *Materially* only. We are willing to allow, That Chriſt ſuffer'd the ſame for Quantity and Quality that we ſhou'd have ſuffer'd, ſo far as there is but probable Proof. *Baxt. of Univerſ. Redempt. p. 78, 79.* But if it were moſt ſtrictly the ſame thing that we were oblig'd to, yet it is not ſufficient to prove, He ſuffer'd under the *Formal Obligation of the Violated Law*, or that He ſtood bound by that Law to ſuffer; for that another Perſon may, in the ſtead of a Criminal, ſuffer the very ſame kind of Pain, or Loſs, That the Criminal himſelf was Condemn'd to, and this by his own Sponſion, and the Will of the Prince: In which caſe I dare appeal to all the Learned in the Law, whether the Obligation be not another; whether the Law by vertue whereof He ſuffers, be not differ-
ing

ing from that which Condemn'd the Malefactor himself.

So that if Christ did (as this Accuser of him, as well as us, says) suffer by vertue of the Violated Law; 'tis not to be conceiv'd, how the threatening of that Law cou'd reach Him, unless He were (as we have hinted)

Either { a Violater of that Law Himself, or
an Antecedent Surety with and for
us.

Which either of these he shall say, it will equally be subversive of the whole Gospel.

§. 3. (1.) Shou'd he have the Front to say, That *Christ was Himself a Violater of that Law*, what more Egregious Blasphemy cou'd he utter against the Author of our Holy Religion? How shou'd He be the Redeemer of Sinners, that was a Sinner Himself! The whole Gospel does depend upon, and necessarily presuppose his Innocency (yea, which is more, his Divinity) as the Foundation of it, *John* 1. 1. Hell it self cannot Foam out greater Rage and Nonse sense than to call *God a Sinner*; and while we are so expressly assur'd, That our Lord Jesus was *holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners*, *Heb.* 7. 26. That *He knew no sin*, *2 Cor.* 1. 21. *Heb.* 4. 15. *1 Pet.* 2. 22. *1 Joh.* 3. 5. *1 Pet.* 1. 19. We shall not so much as suspect, that any one Professing the Christian

Name will imagine, that Christ suffer'd as being a Violater of that Law Himself.

2. If then He suffer'd by Vertue of the Sanction of that Law, it remains that He was an *Antecedent Surety* with and for us; otherwise the Obligation of that Law cou'd never reach Him; and then the Law as given to Adam, must be supposed to run [*Thou shalt obey, or thy Surety for thee; otherwise, thou shalt die, or thy Surety for thee.*] Now if the Original Law did thus take in a Surety, how plain is it, that it was never violated! Our Surety did obey, did fulfill all Righteousness; if then it only oblig'd either Him, or us disjunctively to obey; what ground is there left, whereupon either Christ or we shou'd suffer!

Obj. But I presume some will allege, His Suretiship did only respect the *Sanction*, not the *preceptive part* of the Law; that the Law did not oblige Him to obey; but only (supposing our Disobedience) either He or we must suffer.

Repl. To which it might be reply'd, The Surety's Name is not more Legible in the Penal, than in the Preceptive Part of the Law; and we find He did Obey, as well as Suffer; and therefore have reason to think He was equally oblig'd to Obey, as He was to Suffer. But yet we will suppose it to be (as they wou'd have it) that Christ was only oblig'd

oblig'd in case of our Disobedience; that He was only a Surety with reference to the Penalty; and that the Sense of the Law was [*Thou Adam shalt obey, otherwise, thou or Christ, shall die.*] And thus far at least He must be obnoxious to the Original Law, otherwise He cou'd not possibly suffer under the Obligation of that Law; He cou'd not be said to be (as this Accuser wou'd have it thought He was) *in the same Bond with us*, and oblig'd to suffer by vertue of the Sanction of the same Law that oblig'd us to suffer.

§. 4. Now this Notion in the Consequences of it, is equally subversive of Christianity with the former,

For 1. If the Original Law (as to its Penal Part) was disjunctive, *viz.* either that the Offender shou'd suffer, or Christ for him, then the Gospel had not been the bringing in of a better Covenant, but a performance of the Old. Thus does that Right Reverend Person, to whom this Accuser has Appeal'd, argue against him. Upon this Principle, what the Apostle had so carefully distinguish'd, are confounded together, and made one and the same thing, when upon a comparing 'em together, he does once and again give the Preference to the latter Covenant, (as *Heb.* 7. 22. — 8. 6.) 'tis plain he supposes the one is not the other; or, if the Apostle in that Discourse had a more im-

Of the Sufferings of Christ, last Edition, p. 14.

mediate Reference to the Mosaick Law, his Argument will hold *a fortiori* from hence, in reference to the Original Law. But there is one thing farther I wou'd add under this Head, which perhaps will be of weight with this Accuser and his Friends, and that is, That hereupon the *Gospel must needs be a Law*, the very Old, Original Law, and not so much as a Law of greater Grace; what can there possibly be left to distinguish the Old, Original Law, and the Gospel, if this Principle be admitted?

2. If the Original Law (as to its Penal Part) was disjunctive, it wou'd also follow, That *we are Justifiable*, according to the utmost Rigour of that Law; for supposing the Penalty to be already borne, what has that Law further to Charge upon us? The Psalmist (surely) had much differing Apprehensions of the Matter, when he cried out, *If thou, Lord, shouldst mark Iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?* Psal. 130.

3. The Reverend Dr. Owen's Words upon this place, are very remarkable: "But (says he) may not an Intercessor be obtain'd to Plead on the Behalf of the guilty Soul? *Eli* determines this matter, 1 Sam. 2. 25. *If one Man sin against another, the Judge shall judge him; but if a man sin against the Lord, who shall intreat for him?* There is not, says *Job*, between us, מוֹכִיחַ one that might argue the case,

" in

" in pleading for me, and so make up the
 " Matter, *laying his hand upon us both*, Job
 " 9. 33. We now (as he immediately *Dr. Owen,*
 " adds) consider a Sinner purely under the *on Psal.*
 " Administration of the Law, which knows CXXX.
 " nothing of a Mediator. So that (ac- P. 48.
 cording to him, and indeed according to
 the Truth of the thing) the Original Law
 did not admit or appoint any Mediator, any
 Christ to suffer and plead on the behalf of
 the guilty Soul; and consequently left no
 place for hope. But upon this Supposal,
 That that Law only oblig'd either Christ,
 or us to suffer, what reason was there for
 so dismal Apprehensions? tho' God shou'd
mark Iniquities, resolve to Animadvert upon
 'em with utmost Rigour, *we may yet stand*;
 for that the very rigour of the Law does
 (according to them) require only, that ei-
 ther Christ, or we shou'd suffer, not that
 both shou'd, now then where is the danger
 the Psalmist was so apprehensive of? And
 whence is it, that he does elsewhere so ear-
 nestly deprecate God's Judicial Process, *Psal.*
143. 2. Enter not into judgment with thy ser-
vant, for in thy sight shall no man living be
justify'd. It must needs be, either that the
 Psalmist, or these Men, have very greatly
 misapprehended the Sense of that Law; for
 that according to him, If God shou'd judge
 us by that Law, *no man living cou'd be ju-*
stify'd; whereas according to them, though
 God shou'd judge us by that Law, we can-

not but be Justify'd; for when the threatned Penalty is inflicted, the most rigorous Justice can go no further; we are *Recti in Curia*, when the Law is satisfy'd; no further charge can have place against us.

3. Yea further, it follows, That we never had (as indeed we cou'd never need) a Pardon. The Case will be very plain by a familiar Instance: Suppose two Persons jointly bound for the Payment of a certain Sum of Money, or for the performance of any other Condition or Contract; if either Party pay the Money, or discharge the Bond, the other is quit in Law, and the Creditor cannot be said to have forgiven him. Justice it self is so far from requiring, that it wou'd not admit of double Payment. Now then, if Christ was in the same Bond with us, if either He or we suffer, the Debt is Paid, the utmost Demands of Justice are answer'd; what place is there then left for Forgiveness? Can a Penalty be said to be forgiven, that was not due? or can it be yet due, when 'tis already paid? and is it not in Law paid, if either the Principal or Surety pay it? Upon this Principle then it is plain, That God cannot be said to have forgiven us, to have been gracious to us (*ἀφίεναι, vel χαρίζεσθαι*). For tho' Socinus did (as Grotius has manifested) Argue from those Terms, with great weakness, against all Satisfaction; yet nothing can, with

with greater force and evidence, disprove a full and proper *Solution*. What shall we then say to those numerous Texts, where we and our Sins are said to be *forgiven*? Here-upon the Gospel-Covenant, as offering Remission, *Luke* 24. 47. and the Sacraments of the Gospel, as Sealing it to Sincerely Penitent Believers, *Acts* 2. 38. *Mat.* 26. 28. are render'd meer Impertinencies; and can it be thought these Persons do ever pray for Pardon; or that they do account themselves beholden to God for it? how they can consistently with this their Opinion, I see not.

Moreover, this Doctrine renders our Repentance, and all Obedience of our's needless; and a continued course of the most enormous wickednesses wou'd here-upon be unhurtful to us. If these Persons will be consistent with themselves, it seems necessary for 'em to say (as Dr. *Crisp*) that *Sin can do us no hurt, and Holiness can do us no good*. Upon this Principle, what hurt can Sin, the grossest wickedness do us? Suppose a Person an Atheist, a Blasphemer, an Adulterer, that he live and die such; in this case it can only be said, *The Law was violated*, and therefore the *Threatning must take place*: But if this Notion be true, that the Law threatens only, that either the Sinner or Christ shall die, it cannot touch such a Creature as this, it having been already executed.

And

And alike needless must it needs render Holiness and Obedience in all the Instances of it; for to what purpose is it, can it be suppos'd to be needful, if he may be *accepted with God*, if he may be *Rectus in curia* without it.

5. Again, If this Principle be admitted, *none of our sufferings* wou'd consist with the Justice of God: for that according to them, the Law did oblige only *Christ, or us*, to suffer; if either suffer therefore, full Payment is made; the Law has no farther demands to make; how is it then, that we notwithstanding suffer? that we are subjected to any Sufferings, Spiritual or Temporal (not to make any mention here of Eternal ones) Whence is it that God with-draws the Quickning, or Comforting Influences of his Spirit from any? Whence is it, that He gives up any to their own Hearts Lusts? Whence is it that any are expos'd to the fiery Darts of the wicked one? Or yet, that the Arrows of the Almighty do wound, do stick fast in any Soul? Or, if we shou'd yet come lower, how unaccountable were it, that we shou'd groan under pining Sickneses, noisom Diseases, racking Pains, and at length yield to Death?

It will, perhaps, be pleaded, That God may inflict all these Evils, and many more at pleasure, as being *Absolute Lord* of his Creatures;

tures; but it shou'd be remembred, That having given us a Law, He is become our *Ruler*; and thereby He does declare, That *He will not*, however (antecedently thereto) *He might* have Arbitrarily inflicted any Evil upon us: The very giving out a Law, in and by which it is Enacted, That such certain Evils shall be inflicted upon the Transgressors of it; how plainly does it indemnifie the Non-violaters of it from such Sufferings? Such Threatnings otherwise cou'd answer no End; if it were intended, That whether they violated the Law, or not, they shou'd be alike obnoxious. Now if we consider God as a *Governour*, the Evils He inflicts come under another Consideration; they are not merely Afflictions or Sufferings, but they are also *Punishments*, and therefore they are not dispens'd Arbitrarily, but according to a Stated Rule; He does not punish any but such as by the Law are obnoxious; hence is it that we read of his *Righteousness* in Reference to this Matter.

And as this does more generally evince, That all Evils inflicted by a *Ruler* as such, are *Punishments*; so (with Reference to the particular Instances above-mention'd) it might be distinctly made appear, that *they are*, in the most strict and proper Sense, *Punishments*—In the last (which is not the least doubted) Case, how plain is it! that the Separation of Soul and Body is Penal; that

'tis

'tis a *natural Evil* no one doubts, as such 'tis abhorr'd of all; and that 'tis inflicted for, or by reason of *Sin*, is as unquestionable, if the Apostle's account of the Matter may be allow'd; for so he tells us, *Rom. 5. 12. By one man sin enter'd into the world, and death by sin; and so death pass'd upon all men, for that all have sinn'd.* So that *Death* (amongst Men) has the nature of a *Punishment* in it, but how then comes it to be inflicted, if it be not due? If we be not obnoxious to the Sentence of the Law, it cannot be said to be due to us; if the Threatning was disjunctive, both Parties Bound cou'd not be obnoxious, if Sentence be executed on either, the other is clear; how comes it then that we are punish'd and Christ too! *What shall we say? Is God unrighteous that taketh vengeance?* *Rom. 3. 5.* Or is not this rather an *unrighteous Doctrine*, that wou'd reflect the Imputation of Injustice upon the Holy God?

6. Yet again, According to this Notion, How can the Eternal Damnation of any Soul consist with Divine Justice? This Surety is a Punishment with a witness; but how can it be a *righteous one* if it be not due? And it cannot be due to any Man, if it be already paid; and every Man has paid it, if his Surety have done it. I see not, upon this Principle, how God can, in Justice, Damn any individual Soul: Here then

then is *Universal Redemption*, and *Universal Grace*, beyond the utmost stretch of *Arminianism* it self. What! is it then not only possible that they may, but is it also certain that all shall be Sav'd from Everlasting Perdition! Is there not only a *Sufficiency* of Grace afforded to all, but that *Efficacious* Influence that will secure the Effect! Is God not only *unwilling* to Damn any, but is He also *unjust*, *unrighteous* if He do! 'Tis strange then, that we should read of a *δικαιοσύνη*, *Rom. 2. 5.* and an *ἔρως ἡμάρτανος*, *Heb. 2. 2.* Certainly a Threatning us with Wrath, because of God's righteous Judgment, and with Remediless Ruine, as a just *Recompence of Reward*, cannot but intimate, That God wou'd be Righteous and Just, tho' careless obdurate Sinners shou'd finally perish.

Nay, while we are assur'd, That *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah*, *Jude, v. 7.* and many others, suffer the vengeance of Eternal Fire, and that God has not only *δύναμις*, Power, Ability, *Mat. 10. 28.* but also *ἐξουσία*, Power, Authority, *Luke 12. 5.* to cast into Hell: those, and many like Texts, cannot be more true, than this Opinion is false, that wou'd infer God cannot Punish, cannot cast into Hell, were unjust if He shou'd do it; yea, such a Notion must needs be false, that these Sacred Scriptures may be true.

7. I'll add but one more absurd Consequence of this Opinion (though many more might be subjoyn'd) and that is, That the Patrons of this Principle do hereby greatly obscure, and lessen that *Free-Grace in Christ*, which they so highly pretend to *Exalt* and *Magnifie*. When they have seem'd to advance *Free-Grace* beyond all others, to cry up *Gospel-Grace*, and *Gospel-Predaching*, they do at length subvert all *Purely-Gospel-Grace* at once, and necessarily resolve the Whole of Divine Grace into the Constitution of the *Law of Works*: For, supposing (with them) that Christ's Name was put into the Original Bond; supposing that Law did take in Christ as Surety with us; 'tis not of *Grace*, but Justice, that God is reconcil'd to us, or that we are accepted with Him; it shou'd not be said that we are *Justify'd freely by his Grace*, but that the Rigour of the Law did exact nothing more, and therefore our Justification was a *due debt*, 'twas what was owing to us by Governing Justice; the Righteous God cou'd not Condemn us, having already exacted the threatned Punishment at our Surety's Hands. Now is it so Adorable, so Surprizing *Grace*, that God shou'd be just to his own Law! Is it so very Astonishing and Wonderful a thing, that God shou'd be true to his Word! Thus, after all their Pretences of a more exalted Admiration of, and Value for *Divine Grace*, they

they do by this Notion shrink it into so narrow a Compass, as the Framing the Original Law; and as for all that which the Gospel magnifies as *Grace*, they render it nothing other than *pure Justice*; all Gospel *Grace* shou'd (with them, if they will consist with themselves) be nothing differing from a *due Debt*, tho' the Apostle does so carefully contra-distinguish and oppose 'em to each other, *Rom. 4. 4.*

§. 5. (2.) If Christ did suffer by Vertue of the violated Law, then his Sufferings were most *strictly the same* that we were obnoxious to; this is as plain, as that the Sanction of the Law was the same with it self. But is it to be admitted, that our Lord Jesus Christ was *alienated from the Life and Love of God!* that He was *dead in trespasses and sins!* *deserted of the Spirit of Holiness!* *was his Soul over-run with outrageous and impetuous Lusts!* All which, under one consideration, is our Punishment, tho' under another respect it be also our Sin. Or was the Lord Jesus *bated, abhor'd of the Father!* Did He *lose all right to, and Interest in God's Favour and Kindness?* Did He *bear the stinging Reflections of a guilty Conscience, the horrors of a despairing damned wretch in Hell?* This is but part of the Punishment included in the Threatning against us; but what Pious Soul wou'd not rise with Indignation against any one, that shou'd so far

far Blaspheme the Holy and ever-blessed Redeemer, as to say this was his Case, his State? And if He did not suffer what that Law threatned, it cannot be said that He suffer'd by vertue of that Law. It remains then, that He did only suffer by vertue of the Law of Mediation, as before.

§. 6. (3.) Then the Law oblig'd him to suffer; whereupon it wou'd follow, that neither He cou'd refuse the Undertaking; nor God refuse to accept it as Punishment; but this I shall but mention here.

§. 7. We are next to obviate the seeming Reasonings of this Accuser against this Truth; and what he does loosely (and immethodically enough) offer here and there to this purpose, we shall endeavour to reduce into some Order, that it may appear, with all the force it has, against us; and be more capable of receiving a just Reply. And,

(1.) He does insinuate, That Christ's Sufferings cannot otherwise be an *Act of Rectoral Justice*; but only *Acts of Obedience and Dominion*. Take his own Words: "We are of Opinion, That Sufferings which are not from the Obligations of a Violated Law, cannot be an *Act of Rectoral Justice*, which does Essentially respect the Law in its Distributions.— If a Rector sen-
tenceth

" tenceth any to Sufferings, without a regard to Sin, it is *Unjust Appeal*, p. 7.

And again, " If Mr. B. resolve Christ's Sufferings wholly into a Conformity to the Precept of the Mediatorial Law, — they can be but *Acts of Obedience and Dominion*, not *Acts of Justice*, p. 50, 51. So he goes on, p. 52. " They affirm 'em to be but *Acts of Obedience*, and consequently *Acts of Dominion*, not of *Punitive Justice*. So again, p. 54. The Sufferings of Christ — cou'd not be a *Judicial Act of God*. He (Christ) cou'd not be Condemn'd, nor cou'd Sentence pass upon Him; nor according to any Sentence cou'd He be executed; for where no Obligation to Punishment by the Sanction of the Law, there no *Guilt* in any Sense; where no *Guilt*, no *Condemning*, no *Passing a Sentence justly*, no *Execution*, &c. And P. 56. His Sufferings cou'd be but an *Act of Dominion*.

Now to all this we Answer.

1. That He is so *Confus'd*, and *Unsteady* in the Forming this Objection, that we can hardly so much as guess what it is he means. Sometimes he speaks of the Sufferings of Christ as an *Act of Rectoral Justice*, and a *Judicial Act of God*; where one wou'd think he considers 'em as *inflicted by God*; and yet in other places, he speaks of 'em as

Acts of Justice, where 'tis not certain, but he may refer to 'em as *undertaken by Christ*: Now these two are far from being the same thing, That Christ was not unrighteous in undertaking, and undergoing those Sufferings; and that God was not unrighteous in inflicting and laying 'em upon Him.

Again, he thus confounds, an *Act of Dominion*, and *Acts of Dominion*; whereas the former may import, That the Father (as *Dominus Christi*, as his Lord) might enjoin Him to suffer; and the latter may signifie, That Christ (as *Lord of his own Acts*) might offer, might consent to suffer.

Besides, he confounds Sufferings inflicted by *virtue of the Sanction of the Law*, and Sufferings inflicted, with a regard to *Sin*, and makes the latter signifie as much as the former, whereas we constantly (and with the justest Reason) distinguish betwixt 'em; and allow that in the *Sufferings* of Christ, there was a regard had to *Sin*, to *our Sin*, as what had offended, highly incens'd the Divine Majesty against us, and render'd it necessary (for the Reputation of his Wisdom, Holiness, Justice, and the support of his Governing-Authority) that his Displeasure shou'd in one way or other be manifested against *Sin*, if He shou'd (and that He might) remit the Penalty due to the *Sinner*. And hereupon it was agreed betwixt the
Father

Father and the Son, that Christ shou'd *Suffer*; the Divine Wisdom this way at once providing for the Honour of God, as Governor, and for the Redemption of Apostate-Man. So that we readily grant, there was a *respect had to sin*, in the Sufferings of Christ; yea, that it cou'd not have consisted with the Justice of God as Rector, to Sentence Him to suffer, without a *regard to sin*. But it does not, cannot thence follow, that He suffer'd by *virtue of the Obligation of the Violated Law*; that that Law oblig'd Him to suffer; unless you will also say, That that Law oblig'd God to Save Sinners, and to appoint this Ransom for them. But,

2. Supposing him to mean (as his Reference to the Bishop of Worcester's Letter wou'd intimate) That unless we will allow Christ's *Sufferings* to have been by virtue of the *violated Law*, they cou'd not be inflicted by God as a *Ruler*, but only as an *absolute Lord*. We deny the Consequence: neither is it to be allow'd, unless he can make it appear, that this is the *only Law*, by virtue whereof Christ cou'd be oblig'd to suffer.

And therefore also, it might be (and was) a *Judicial Act* of God, an Act of his *Rectoral Justice* to inflict Sufferings upon Christ, because the *Law of Mediation* ren-

der'd him obnoxious to Sufferings: and being hence oblig'd to suffer (and, in that general Sense, having *guilt* upon Him) He might have Sentence justly pass'd and executed upon Him; and accordingly we find (in that Prophetical Psalm, 22. 3.) Christ Justifies God the Father under the very depth of his Sorrows.

Nay, Christ's Sufferings did not only *consist* with the Justice of God as a Rector; but did also *declare* and demonstrate it to the World, *Rom.* 3. 25, 26. God *set Him forth*, set Him in view of all the World, by *Him* (by his Blood) to *declare his Righteousness*, that He might be, and appear to be just, though He was a Justifier of sinful Men. As we shall (God willing) more fully clear, when we come to deal with the Socinian Adversaries, in the *Second Part* of this Discourse.

(3.) Whereas he argues from their being *Acts of Obedience* (in our Opinion) that consequently we must hold, that they are only *Acts of Dominion*, &c. We again deny the Consequence; nay, rather think the direct opposite shou'd have been inferr'd, *viz.* That because we do consider the Sufferings of Christ, as *Acts of Obedience* to a Law, therefore God is not, in reference hereto, to be look'd upon as a meer Lord or Owner, but also as a *Ruler*.

And

And we are the less afraid of having any ill consequence prov'd upon us, as to this, because (which yet this Accuser, as if he very little convers'd with the Scriptures, seems not to know) 'tis consecrated *Language* as well as *Divine Truth*; 'tis not only the *sense*, but also the *words* of the Holy Ghost, *Rom.* 5. 19. *Phil.* 2. 8. *Heb.* 5. 8. So that the Sufferings of Christ were *Acts of Obedience*, and consequently we may infer, did correspond to the *Precepts* of a Law, and what other could it be but that of *Mediation*: Accordingly, in reference to these very Sufferings, our Saviour himself tells us, That he acted herein pursuant to a *Command* he had receiv'd of his Father, *John* 10. 17, 18. He says not, this I was oblig'd to by the *threatning* of one or other Law; but a *Command* I have received to this purpose, and I'm ready to obey; for thus also in the *Volum* of the *Book* it is written of him, *Lo, I come to do thy Will, O God*; for to the offering of his *Body*, the Apostle does apply those words, *Heb.* 10. 7——10.

(4.) And lastly, To close this head, we add, That if indeed we had said, that the Sufferings of Christ had *no respect at all to the violated Law*, he might then (with some force of Reason) have inferr'd upon us, that we thereby render'd 'em, with the *Socinians*, a meer *Act of Dominion* upon Christ, and not (in any sense) an *Act of*

Justice : But he cannot but know, that we willingly grant, that they had *some Reference even to the Sanction of that Law*, and that both

{ The Law, obliging us to suffer, was the ground and reason of his Undertaking to suffer.

as, { His Sufferings did in great part answer the Ends, for which that Sanction was annex'd to the Law.

(1.) The *Law*, as obliging us to suffer, was the *Ground* the Reason of *Christ's* Undertaking to suffer ; but his *Sufferings* themselves, were by reason of that *Undertaking* ; had it not been that we were under sentence of Death by that Law, we had not needed a Mediator ; Nay further, could that Sentence have been remitted without any *satisfaction* made ; Could the Threatning have been absolutely recall'd (so as that no severe Marks of Divine Displeasure should have been left upon Sin) and this without weakning his Authority, and rendring the Majesty of Heaven cheap : Christ had never suffer'd, never undertaken to suffer — But these things are vastly differing ; to say that *upon this Reason* Christ undertook to suffer ; and to say, that *that very Sanction* oblig'd him to suffer ; in the former Case, 'tis no more than *loco causæ Obligatoriæ* ; in the latter, it would be the *Obligatory Cause it self*.

(2.) Christ's Sufferings did, in great part answer the *Ends of that Sanction*; as will appear, if we consider for what purposes a Sanction was added to the Law; and amongst others, such as these do readily occur, *viz.* thereby to express God's hatred of Sin; to secure the Law and Lawgiver from Contempt; and to enforce Obedience, &c. Now these Ends of the Threatning were answer'd as well (perhaps better) by the Sufferings of Christ, than they could have been by the sufferings of Sinners themselves. Yet it cannot therefore be said, that the *Threatning it self* was executed upon Christ. In short, some respect the Sufferings of Christ had to the violated Law, as is above said, but not *such*, as that it can be said with Truth, either that that Law oblig'd Him to suffer, or that it was fulfill'd in and by his Sufferings.

(2.) He does next Insinuate, As if Christ cou'd not be a Mediator, at least, not suffer as such; unless He suffer'd by Vertue of the Violated Law. This (surely) must be his Sense, if he have any, P. 25. where he says, "That though Christ came not under the Obligation of the Law of Works, but by the Father's Will, and his own Consent—Yet (on his Entering into the Office of a Mediator) the Obligation to suffer for Sin, is immediately by Vertue of the Sanction of the Law. I take him

to mean, That tho' He was not a Mediator, without the Appointment of God, and his own Consent, yet upon his very becoming a Mediator, the Obligation of the violated Law must immediately lay hold upon Him; so that tho' He might have avoided Suffering, had He declin'd his Mediatory Undertaking; yet supposing Him to Mediate, the Violated Law immediately seizeth on Him, and obliges Him to suffer. To which we Answer,

1. The Violated Law did indeed oblige the Sinner himself to suffer; but that it did or con'd oblige any one else, is what (how oft soever it be said) has never yet been prov'd.

2. Nor does Christ's merely entering into the Office of a Mediator, necessarily (and in the nature of the thing) oblige Him to suffer; for it is conceivable, (as a thing very possible) that He might have Mediated for a mitigation of our Sufferings only. Suppose (for instance) that instead of the Torments of Hell for ever, we might only endure those Tortures for a determinate Number of Years. I would not be mistaken: I am not saying Christ did so, being well assur'd He did otherwise; nor am I devising a better Method, or one equally good with that which took place: 'Tis not without inexpressible Delight and Gratitude.

tude, that I do own and adore the Infinitely excellling Wisdom and Goodness, that is conspicuous in the Gospel-way of Mediation. All I say is, That in the nature of the thing 'twas not impossible, there might have been a Mediation set on foot to this purpose; in which case I ask, how it does appear, that the Mediator Himself must needs suffer? And this with a design to convince *Our Accuser*, his Argument can have no force in it; for that it must according to all Rules of Logick, proceed upon this Indefinite and Unlimited Proposition, *Whoever Mediates for an obnoxious Criminal, shall suffer.* Which Proposition is not to be allow'd, unless every one that Mediates (*in what way soever*) for such an one must needs suffer: An Assertion so weak, that barely to mention it is sufficiently to expose it; yet if he shou'd limit it to this, or any other special Case, 'twould there only be a naked Assertion, and no Argument.

3. But supposing Christ was (as I willingly grant he was) upon his entring into the Office of a Mediator oblig'd to suffer for Sin; yet still, it appears not that He is so, *immediately* by virtue of the *Sanction of the Law*. That the Sufferings of the Mediator had a *Respect* to the Sanction of the Law (as before) we grant; but that He was properly oblig'd by that Law to suffer (whether mediately, or immediately) is what we believe,

lieve this Accuser, can never prove. The violated Law never said, *If Christ Mediate for Sinners, He shall die*; but another Law that was peculiar to Himself, and which we therefore call the *Law of Mediation*.

(3.) But he proceeds, "If Christ's Obligation to Suffer did not result from this Law (i. e. the Violated Law) *our sins were not the Impulsive Cause* of his Sufferings, *Ibid.* p. 25. And he adds, p. 41. "It's impossible Sin shou'd be their *Meritorious Cause*. And again, p. 50. "If Christ's Sufferings be not — by vertue of the Penal Sanction of a violated Law, our Sins cannot be their Meritorious Cause.

The Answer to this we must defer to the *Fourth Chapter*, where we shall have occasion to speak fully to it. Again,

(4.) He does also suggest, in the last quoted Pages, That *Christ's Sufferings* cou'd not otherwise be a proper Punishment — The Consideration whereof is also to be reserv'd for the *Fifth Chapter* of this Discourse. Moreover,

(5.) He does next intimate, That it was either by vertue of that Sanction (i. e. that of the Violated Law) or by vertue of no Sanction at all, that Christ was oblig'd to suffer: For that

that according to us, the *Mediatorial Law* had no Penal *Sanction*; and thereupon he challenges us to shew, by *virtue of what Sanction* Christ was oblig'd to suffer, *Vst. p. 26.* In Answer whereto,

We distinguish be- } In a more Loose and
twixt a Sanction } General Sense;
In a more Strict and
Proper one.

Accordingly we say,

1. In the strictest Sense, as it does import the *Threatning* that is annex'd to a Law, we see not how it can be said, that Christ was oblig'd to Suffer by virtue of any *Sanction*; for that we know no Law that threaten'd Him. But,

2. If we understand the Word in a looser and more general Sense, as signifying only an *Ordination* at large; we may say, *Sanction fuit*, it was Ordain'd, Enacted by the Law of Mediation, that He shou'd suffer for Sin; and so He was oblig'd to suffer by virtue of that *Sanction*.

6. In the last place, He does advance a very formidable Argument against us, *viz.* That (upon the fore-mention'd Principle) we cannot hold Christ's Sufferings to have been in our place and stead, otherwise than as it

it signifies only *for our Benefit* and Advantage. This he enlarges upon, p. 29, 30.

To which we Reply, *First*, and more generally, That all that make use of that Distinction, are not agreed upon one and the same Sense; and therefore the Sense of the Terms shou'd be fix'd, before they can signify any thing in an Argument. 'Tis possible such a Sense may be affix'd to one, or other of the Terms, in which it may be true, that we cannot hold Christ's Sufferings to have been *in our place and stead*, or to have been otherwise so, than as it signifies *for our good*. Who knows what Secret Sense this Accuser may understand these Phrases in, by which he may prove his charge against us.

We shou'd therefore know, what it is he means, both by Christ's Suffering *in our place and stead*, and by his Suffering *for our benefit and advantage*: For by knowing only his Sense of one of these Phrases, we cannot possibly Conjecture, whether the other (with him) import less or more, or just the same thing. Yet,

2. And more particularly, tho' we cannot (in his declar'd Sense) hold that Christ suffer'd *in our place*, yet it will not follow, that we do not (or cannot) hold that He suffer'd

suffer'd *in our stead*, otherwise than as it signifies *for our good only*. But what we do, (and consistently with our selves can) maintain his Suffering *in our stead*, in such a Sense in which the Socinians ever deny'd it, shall (thro' Divine Assistance) be made appear in the *Second Part* of this Discourse.

CHAP. II.

That Christ did not Suffer in the Person of Sinners, but in the Person of a Mediator.

§. 1. **T**HIS also he would have to be accounted amongst our Errors, as appears not only from several Passages in his *Appeal*, but also from his objecting this, amongst other faults, against the *Third Paper* (in his *Report*) viz. *That it was so worded as to be calculated to their Meridian, who hold, That Christ suffer'd only in the Person of a Mediator, not in the Person of Sinners.*

§. 2. That Christ was a *Mediator*, and did suffer as (or in the Person of) a Mediator, I will suppose is no part of the Controversie betwixt the Accuser and us: All that can then remain as questionable, is, Whether he suffer'd as (or in the Person of) a Sinner---- which being affirm'd, shou'd also have been prov'd by this Accuser: We being only Doubters or Deniers in this Point, have nothing to do but only to hear his Proofs: No Rules I have yet met with, oblige us to any thing more.

§. 3.

S. 3. Yet since he has not (as might have been expected) done his part; or perhaps, could not do it; we shall more than do our own; that it may appear, what it is we do herein deny, and upon what Reasons we do it. And

S. 4. In order to a better understanding the state of the Case, it should be considered, That the Phrase it self is what the Scriptures are utterly a Stranger to: We no where read in those sacred Oracles, either of Christ's sustaining, or suffering in *the Person of Sinners*; and 'tis but reasonable for us, when Articles of Faith are propos'd to, nay press'd upon us, to hesitate about 'em (can we be blam'd, if we also deny, renounce 'em) unless Scripture-Evidence be produc'd for 'em. If their sense of this (or any other) Phrase appear in the Scriptures, we shall readily own that sense; but the Phrase it self cannot be thought necessary, while it is not there.

S. 5. But besides, This is not only an Humane Phrase, but a very obscure and ambiguous one; and 'tis hard to conceive (amongst the many senses it is capable of) any one sense, in which it may be tolerably apply'd to the present Case. We shall briefly mention some of the more remarkable Notations of the Word [*Person*:] And passing by several others, I shall only take
 notice

notice of the vastly differing sense in which the Word is us'd by *Metaphysicians*, and by *Civilians*.

S. 6. The word [*Person*] as made use of by *Metaphysicians*, is design'd to express an individual, compleat, intelligent Substance. Thus every Man, and every Angel are distinct Persons; and Christian Philosophers transfer this account of the word [*Person*] to Christ as God-Man; yea, and to the God-Head it self, when they use that Term with reference to the Sacred Three, *Father*, *Son* and *Holy Ghost*. But in this sense 'tis not to be admitted, that Christ suffer'd in the *Person* of Sinners; for that in order to his suffering in any *Person* (one or other) it was first necessary he should assume that *Person*; Now, however he did assume the Nature of Man, yet he did not, 'twas not possible that he should, in this sense, assume the *Person* of any Sinner. Surely this Accuser himself will not dare to assert, That Christ was the individual Substance of *Peter*, *Judas*, &c. if not, he was not their *Person*; and if not their *Person*, then he did not suffer as such.

S. 7. Or if they should refer us to *Civilians* for the sense of the word, 'tis amongst them a very perplex'd and un-agreed Term. Sometimes they do only in general contradi-
 distinguish *Persons* to *Things*, and make the
 word

word *Person* to be æquivalent to the word *Man*. Thus Zouch, *Res sunt de quibus homines* Elementa
agunt ; Personæ quæ agunt in se ; i. e. Viri & Furisprud.
Mulieres: qui Hominis appellatione continentur. P. 1. S. 7, 8.

Yet according to others, this Term of *Person* is not so extensive as that of *Man*. So Lexic.
Calvin tells us, *Personæ appellatio cum ho-* Furid.
minis appellatione non est eadem ; hæc enim Sub Tit.
quam illa est generalior—— Omnis Persona Persona.
est homo, sed non vicissim. Inde Persona de-

finitur Homo, qui caput habet civile. By *caput civile habens*. he does not (as some apprehend) mean one that has a *Civil Head*, or a superiour in the State ; then indeed (as they infer) a King would be no *Person* ; but what he and other *Civilians* intend by it, is one that has the liberties of a *Free-born Subject* in the State ; and so is design'd only to exclude Prisoners of War, Bond-Slaves, &c. from being *Persons*. Thus Sub Tit.
 he explains himself at large, *Qui in Capite.*

eum (scil. liberorum) ordinem cooptatur, caput jam habere dicitur : Unde servus, qui Lexic.
pro libertate pretium persolvit, pretium pro capite Furid.
solvere dicitur, apud Plantum & J. consultos frequentissime, i. e. ut liceat illi caput in Sub Tit.
ordinem liberorum habere : Qui, si postea libertate mulctetur, capite minutus dicitur ;
 and thus also the Learned *Pufendorf* explains it : *Persona apud J. Consultos præprimis,* Elementa
illa dicitur, quæ caput (i. e. libertatem personalem) habet. Furisprud.
 But this distinction is not P. 19.

to be admitted with reference to the Sufferings of Christ; in dying he had a respect, not only to Jews, but to Gentiles; and amongst them not only to the Learned Greeks, but also to the more *uncultivated Barbarians and Scythians*; not only to such as were free among 'em, but also to the very *bond slaves*, Rom. 10. 12. 1 Cor. 12. 13. Gal. 3. 28. Col. 3. 11.

§. 8. Again, sometimes they do by the Term [*Person*] intimate (not absolutely the Man himself, but) the Man *respectively* consider'd, with Reference to the Quality, State or Condition, in which he stands. So Calvin, *ubi supra*. *Persona tam hominem, quam qualitatem hominis & conditionem significat.*

*De jure
naturæ &
gentium,
lib. 1. cap. 1
§. 12.*

*To the
same pur-
pose he al-
so speaks:
Elem. Fu-
risp. lib. 1.
Def. 4.*

And more fully, Pufendorf, *Personæ morales — sunt homines — considerati cum statu suo aut munere, in quo in vita communi versantur.*

Now will this Accuser say, That in this Sense Christ did sustain, and suffer in the *person of Sinners*? Was He every one of those very Men for whom He died? Did He possess the place, state, condition, quality of every individual Sinner.

§. 9. But amongst *Political Persons* (to omit other Sub-divisions) there is one special kind, which they call *Representative Persons*;

Persons; and this I suppose may be intended, when 'tis said, That Christ suffer'd in the Person of Sinners. Under this rank the Civilians do commonly reckon *Embassadors, Plenipotentiaries, Vice-Roys, &c.* as acting in the Person of the Prince that Commissionates 'em: *Members of Parliament*, as Personating or Representing those that do Elect 'em: *Advocates or Attorneys*, as Pleading in the Person of their Clients: *Tutors and Guardians*, acting for, and in the Name of the Pupils and Minors, with whom they are entrusted: *a Servant*, or any other *Delegate*, whom we Authorise and Appoint to pay Money, or Transact any other Affair for us; so far as any one does with Authority manage any of our Affairs, he may in some Sense be said to *Represent us*, or to do it *in our Person*. Now if in any tolerable Sense it may be said, That Christ suffer'd in the *Person* of Sinners, it must (I conceive) be in this, that He did suffer as their *Representative*.

S. 10. And therefore, that it may the better appear, how far He did, and wherein He did not Represent, or personate us in his Sufferings, we should carefully distinguish,

I. Betwixt Christ's *Representing us in his Sufferings*; and representing us in his *Obedience*.

2. Betwixt his Representing, or *Personating a Sinner* in his Sufferings, and his Representing or *Personating Sinners* therein.

3. Betwixt his Representing, or *Personating sinners* when He suffer'd, only in some very limited and *restrain'd Sense*; and his Representing 'em therein *simply and absolutely*.

4. We may also distinguish betwixt a *Representative*, that is deputed and delegated thereto *by us*; and one that is appointed and authoriz'd *by God*.

§. 11. Whereupon I add, I. He did not so far Represent, or Personate Sinners in his *Holiness and Obedience*, as in his *Sufferings*; 'tis (as we shall immediately shew) in some Sense allowable to say, Christ *suffer'd* in the Person of a Sinner, or Sinners; but I know no Sense in which it may be said, That He *obey'd* in the Person of a Sinner, or Sinners. He did not Personate a Sinner, much less Sinners, in his sinless Obedience; this were as grossly absurd (as Mr. Baxter himself hints) as it would be to say, *In the Person of Sinners He never sinned*. Now this we the rather take notice of, because this Accuser extends Christ's Personating us indifferently, and equally, to both his Obedience and his Sufferings; for thus he speaks in

in his late *Defence*, p. 28. *Christ's thus suffering and obeying in the Person of Sinners, it is to all intents and purposes as effectual, as if they did it themselves.* And what any *Libertine* or *Antinomian* wou'd say more than this, I know not; or which way he will can, make this consist with the necessity of Faith and Repentance, in order to our actual Discharge from Punishment (which yet he largely asserts, *Appeal*, p. 8. 9.) I cannot imagine.

§. 12. II. It is more allowable to say, That Christ suffer'd in the *Person of a Sinner*, than that He suffer'd in the *Person of Sinners*: for that the former of these signifies no more, than that He suffer'd *as a Sinner*. Now that may be suppos'd to intimate, either that Christ, in the inflicting Sufferings upon Him, was *dealt with like a Sinner*; or also, that therein He was *reputed and declar'd a Sinner*, suffer'd under that Imputation and Charge: And both these are true; the former, whether we consider Him as suffering under the Hand of God or Men; and even the latter also, so far as Men were concern'd in 'em; He died by their Sentence as a Blasphemer.

§. 13. III. Yet in a very *Limited and restrain'd Sense* it may be said, That Christ suffer'd in the *Person of Sinners*; that is, so far as that He suffer'd *in our room and stead*,

He stood before God as an Undertaker to suffer for our sins, and accordingly became a Sacrifice for us: If any one will say He was our Representative, or suffer'd in our Person thus far, I shall not contend with him. Nor would Mr. Baxter neither, as is plain from such Passages as these——

Treat. of
Justifying
Righteous.
page 56.

“are agreed, That the *Person* of the *Sponsor*,
“and of every particular *Sinner*, are di-
“verse; and that Christ had not suffer'd if
“we had not sinn'd; and that He, as a
“Sponsor, suffer'd in our stead, and so bore
“the Punishment which (not He, but) we
“deserv'd: If any will here, instead of a
“*Mediator* or *Sponsor*, call Him *our Repre-*
“*sentative*, and say that He suffer'd in all
“our Persons reputatively, —— not repre-
“senting our Persons *simply*, and in all re-
“spects, and to all ends; but *only so far* as
“to be a Sacrifice for our Sins, and to suf-
“fer in our place and stead. We take
“this (*says he*) to be but *lis de Nomine* ——
“and will not oppose any Man that thinks
“those Words fittest, as long as we agree
“in the Matter signify'd.

Ibid. p. 58.

Again, “Christ suffer'd in our stead, and
“in a large sense, “to certain uses, and in
“some respects, as the *Representer*, or in
“the *Person of sinners*.

Ibid. p. 56.

Yet further, “Though the *Person* of
“the *Mediator* be not really, or reputa-
“tively the *very Person* of each *sinner*, yet
“it does belong to the *Person* of the
“Me-

“ Mediator, so far (*limitedly*) to bear the
 “ *Person of a sinner*, and to stand in the
 “ place of the Persons of all Sinners, as to
 “ bear the Punishment they deserv’d, and
 “ to suffer for their Sin.

I’ll mention but one more, though there
 be several other Passages to this purpose—

“ It belongs to Him (Christ) as Mediator,
 “ to undertake the Sinner’s Punishment in
 “ his own Person; and if any will improp-
 “ perly call that, the *Personating* and repre-
 “ senting of the *sinner*, let ’em limit it, and
 “ confess that it is *not simply*, but *in tantum*,
 “ so far, and to such uses, and no other;
 “ and that yet Sinners did it not in and by
 “ Christ, but only Christ for them, to con-
 “ vey the Benefits as He pleas’d; and then
 “ we delight not to quarrel about meer
 “ Words, though we like the Phrase of Scrip-
 “ ture better.

§. 14. IV. So far as He did Represent,
 or Personate us in his Sufferings; He did it
not as our Deputy, or Delegate; we did not
 order, nor could we authorize Him there-
 unto; not being capable either of obliging
 Him to suffer, or of empowering Him in
 such Sufferings to represent us, and stand
 in our stead: But, He voluntarily consent-
 ing to suffer for us, *God authoriz’d and ap-
 pointed Him* thereunto; and from that Di-
 vine Appointment his Sufferings become ef-
 ficacious for us; and therefore from thence

it is, from that Appointment of God, that it must be adjusted *how far*, and to *what ends and uses*, He shou'd suffer as the Representative, or in the Person of Sinners; and in *what way and method*, and upon *what terms* his Sufferings shou'd be of Saving Benefit and Effect to 'em. Christ did not represent us *as far as we please*; or to *what ends and uses we please*; nor will his Sufferings be effectually Saving to us in *what way and method we please*, upon *any*, or *no terms*, as we think fit; but all this is (according to Divine Pleasure) unalterably Determin'd and Fix'd, by that Appointment and Law of God, by which it was also ordain'd, That Christ our Mediator shou'd be Sacrific'd for us. He cou'd not *Personate us* farther than He was allow'd and impower'd of God; and how far therefore his Commission did extend, or with what Limitations it was attended, is only to be Collected from the Oracles of God; so far then, as it shall appear by the Sacred Scriptures, that Christ suffer'd *in the Person of sinners*, or as their Representative, we shall readily agree, and no farther.

§. 15. V. and Lastly, The Veneration we have for those Sacred Oracles, will not admit us (*without any limitation*) to say, as this Accuser does, that Christ suffer'd *as the Representative, or in the Person of sinners*: The Reasons whereof will the better appear, if it be first agreed what is the exact and proper

per Notion of such a Person, a Representative Person: and in this Matter, I suppose, our Accuser is not unwilling (and for my part, I am most willing) that the Learned *Pufendorf* should be our Instructor. This therefore is the account he gives us of it, *Peculiaris species Personarum politicarum est, quas dicere possis Representativas, ideo quod Personam aliorum referant: quæ scilicet potestate & auctoritate agendi ab aliquo instructæ, hujus vice negotia expediunt eodem cum effectu, ac si ab illo ipso essent confectæ.*

*De Jure
Nat. &
Gent. lib.
1, cap. 1.
§. 12.*

So that according to him (and indeed according to the truth of the thing) so far as any one is allow'd to Represent another, they are both in Law reputed *one Person*; and thereupon, whatever he has, does, or suffers as a Representative, it is (*eodem cum effectu, i. e.* as this Accuser well enough *Englishe*s it) to all intents and purposes the same thing, as if it were had, done, or suffer'd by that other whom he Represents.

§. 16. Now, if it be the *same thing*, then 'tis neither more or less, than if we had so suffer'd our selves; there are therefore two things that we have to plead against Christ's thus Personating, or Representing us; and they are, that such a Representation of us by Christ, is in differing respects, both *too much* and *too little* to answer the Exigencies

of our case, and the Scripture-account of this matter.

§. 17. And (1.) In some respects, Such a *Representative personating of sinners* in and by Christ's Sufferings, would render 'em too little to answer the Exigencies of our Case, and the account which the Scriptures give of 'em: For if Christ in his sufferings was look'd upon as properly, and *most strictly* our Person or Representative, his sufferings (as has bin hinted) would be but the *same thing*, and no more in Value or Vertue, than if we our selves had so suffered: But if we our selves had suffer'd as Christ did, would it have been effectual to the great and necessary purposes of obtaining Redemption, Reconciliation, Pardon, the Holy Spirit, and Eternal Salvation for us! Can any one think? Dare any one say, Our own suffering what Christ did, Our own dying as he did, would (*by way of merit*) have procur'd such consequent Blessings as the *Death and Sufferings* of Christ did!

Such as the mention'd Blessings we need'd, our Case call'd for; and these Blessings we find attributed to the *Death of Christ*, as what did (*meritoriously*, and by way of a price) procure 'em for us—— So the Apostle tells us, *we have Redemption through his blood*, Eph. 1. 7. Col. 1. 14. He obtain'd it
for

for us by his own blood, Heb. 9. 12. so 1 Pet. The word
 1. 18, 19. So also our Reconciliation is the ^{quasie} purchase of his Blood; this account we ^{in the} have of it, Rom. 5. 10. When we were ene- ^{Greek, as} also
 and

חַטָּאת in the Hebrew, do admit of two very differing Senses; they signifie either *sin in self*, or a *sin-offering*, a Sacrifice for Sin; as cannot be unknown to any that are conversant with the Scriptures of the Old Testament and the New, in the Languages in which they were endited by the Inspir'd Penmen; the Instances to that purpose are too numerous to be over-look'd; I'll name a few, Isa. 53. 10. When he shall make his soul **חַטָּאת** an offering for sin; So we read it there. And in Lev. 7. This is the Law **חַטָּאת** (not of the sin, but) of the sin-offering, verse 1. So verse 2. They shall kill, **חַטָּאת** the sin-offering, the blood thereof shall be sprinkle, &c. So Verse 3. **חַטָּאת** it is a sin-offering. Once more, 1 Sam. 6. 3, 4. If ye send away the Ark of the God of Israel, send it not empty but in any wise return Him **חַטָּאת** (not Sin but) a sin-offering. then said they **חַטָּאת** what shall be the sin-offering; which you find afterwards specified in that Verse.

So for the other word **חַטֵּאת** how promiscuously is it us'd in that one Chapter, Lev. 4. If any one of the common People, **חַטֵּאת** there it is commit a sin, verse 27. And so again, ver. 28. If **חַטֵּאת** his sin which he hath sin'd, come to his knowledge, then he shall bring his offering [a kid, &c.] for his sin which he hath sin'd; there you have the same Word again. Yet in the very next Verse the Sense of the Word is chang'd, and that very Kid which is offer'd, is call'd **חַטָּאת**. So verse 29. And he shall lay his hand upon the head **חַטָּאת** ('tis not now to be read of the sin, but) of the sin-offering: and slay **חַטָּאת** the sin-offering: The very Word that, but the Verse before, signify'd *Sin in self*. The same Word you have again twice for a sin-offering, ver. 33. And again, the

Priest ^{take of the} ^{blood} ^{of the sin-offering,} ^{shows} ^{us} ^{that} ^{we} ^{were} ^{reconciled} ^{to} ^{God} ^{by} ^{the} ^{Death} ^{of} ^{his} ^{Son}. And having through several *Ver-*
ses before spoken of this *Reconciliation*, he
at length tells us, that *God made him to be*

ver. 34. It would be endless to refer you to the many other places of Scripture, where the same Observation would occur; I'll therefore only mention one Text more (which may help to evince the Usefulness hereof in interpreting several difficult Texts of Scripture) and that is, *Hos. 4. 8. They eat up* אֲכָלוּ *the sin of my People*; so we read it; but it were scarce possible, to devise any tolerable Sense that the Words cou'd be capable of, according to that reading; yet what we have observ'd, renders 'em exceeding easie and plain; all the Difficulty disappears when you read, *They eat up the sin-offering of my people*; And by this Reading of the Words, the latter part of the Verse may be also most satisfactorily accounted for; *they set their bears on their Iniquity*; i. e. they rejoic'd at, or are pleas'd with it.

Thus does the very ingenious and Reverend Bishop of Salisbury Comment upon the Words:

“ That corrupt Race of Priests (says he) attended still up-
“ on the Temple, and offer'd up the *sin-offering*, and Feasted
“ upon their Portion: ----- And because of the Advantage
“ this brought 'em, they were glad at the abounding of Sin,
“ &c. *Discourse of the Pastoral Care*, p. 23. (A Tract so very
valuable and useful, that having mention'd it, I cou'd not for-
bear to recommend it, though I cou'd wish what is said of
Praying by the Spirit, p. 199, 200. were re-view'd by the very
Reverend Author, and some-what more distinctly Explain'd;
that he might not seem to reflect upon *Praying by the Spirit* it
self, when (I suppose) he only intends to animadvert upon
some Persons mistaken Apprehensions of it; The same I cou'd
also wish in reference to one or two Passages in that Book
which I may not now stay to mention.

Now the words that the LXX. use in those places, are *ἀμαρτία*, and *ἁμαρτία*, and *πλημелία*— but we shall only take notice of the second of those Words, [*ἁμαρτία*] and sometimes indeed by a reduplicated Article, or by a Preposition, they plainly refer to some or other Word that is under-

Fin

sin, i. e. a *sin-offering* for us, to intimate to stood.
us which way that *Reconciliation* was pro- So we
cur'd and brought about, 2 Cor. 5. 21. He read in
made him to be *sin*, &c. that 4th
Chap. of
Leviticus,

sometimes τὴν ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν, and τὴν ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν, and chap.
6. ver. 25. τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ----- Where the Word immediately
fore-going is most probably refer'd to, i. e. in one place χίμα-
ρος, the *she-goat*, in another χίμαρος, the *he-goat*; and in the third,
θυσία, the *burnt-offering*; sometimes the Phrase is ἁμαρτία,
vel μετὰ ἁμαρτίας, for *sin*, where the Word θυσία, *Sacrifice*,
is plainly enough intimated, though not express'd: yet some-
times again there is nothing more than the bare Word ἁμαρ-
τία, *Sin*, express'd, where yet a *Sin-offering* must needs be
meant; for instance, Lev. 4. 21. ἁμαρτία συναγωγῆς ἔστω,
it is (not a *Sin*, but) a *Sin-offering* for the *Congregation*. And
Lev. 6. 25. ἵνα ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίας, *This is the Law*
(surely not that they should *Sin* by, but that they should *Sacrifice*
according to) *the Law of the Sin-offering*. So also in that
mention'd Hos. 4. 8. ἁμαρτίας λαὸς φάγοντας, *they eat* (not
the Sins, for how cou'd that be done, but) *the Sin-offering of*
the People.

And the New Testament Stile is generally conform'd to the
Septuagint: thus you read here also, μετὰ ἁμαρτίας, Heb. 10. 6.
in *burnt-offerings*, and for *Sin* (i. e. and in *Sacrifices* for *Sin*,
as we render it) *Thou hast had no pleasure*. And Rom. 8. 3. we
are told, That *God condemn'd Sin in the flesh of Christ*; but
how, which way? by sending Him in our likeness, to die a *Sacrifice*
for *Sin*. And since the Word will as well signify a *Sacrifice*
for *Sin*, as *Sin* it self, it should surely be readily agreed to
intend only a *Sacrifice* for *Sin*, in that 2 Cor. 5. 20. He made
Him to be a *Sin-offering* for us, &c. Nor does any thing in the
Context discountenance this Reading --- He that knew no *Sin*,
was not a *Sinner*, what should hinder but He might be (nay,
for that very reason was He the fitter to be) made a *sin-offering*
for us: I cou'd not therefore read Mr. *Cross's* Objection,
without a Smile, when he alledges against our thus Interpre-
ting *Sin* for a *Sin-offering*; that then *Sin* wou'd be us'd Equivo-
And

cally in
differing
Senses;
and sup-

pose it be, 20. *Christ is said to have made peace through the Blood of his Cross*; but wou'd our Death

would the
all Consequence be? Why, he tells you, *The Apostle then would bring a Sophism instead of an Argument. He knew no Sin properly, ergo, He was made Sin.* *Cross's Two Sermons on Justification and Imputed Righteousness*, p. 32. Now what if this Text be a naked Assertion, and not design'd for an Argument, what Sophistry would there be in it, if the Apostle barely tell us, *He that was no Sinner Himself, was yet made a Sacrifice for our Sin.* But if he will have no Argument of it, 'twill be as weak and impertinent, though the Words should be Interpreted according to his Mind: *He knew no sin properly, ergo, He was made Sin*; I see no Consequence in it, whether the Phrase bare his Sense or ours. As to what he next alledges, p. 33. *from its Opposition to Righteousness*, it signifies as little; for that the Apostle is not here (there is no appearing proof that he is) Critically Contradistinguishing Christ's being *made Sin*, and our being *made Righteousness*; nay, the contrary is plain, for that he uses differing Words in reference to Christ and us to intimate that he did not intend, Christ was *made sin*, in the same way, or sense, that we are *made Righteousness*; nor can he for that Alteration, be justly charg'd again as *Sophisticating*, whilst he only designs to acquaint us, *That our being made Righteousness* (take it in one Sense or other) *did pre-require, and derive from Christ's having been made a Sacrifice for us.* As to his Third Allegation against us, I can't guess what he produc'd it for. And for his Fourth, that the Word *made* is sometimes us'd for *Imputed*, if that shou'd be granted him, yet still it must be added, That 'tis where other Words are found in the Greek Text; for I remember not (nor do I think our Opposer can produce) one single Instance where the Word *ποίησιν* (which is made use of in the Text) does carry that Sense: it does most plainly intimate the work of an *Effective Agent*; and therefore does strongly argue for our Sense of the Text, That *He was*
have

have avail'd to any such purpose? If not, ^{made a Sa-}
 how can he herein be said strictly to have ^{crifice for}
 Represented us— ^{Sin, made}
^{sin in such}
^{a Sense as}

that GOD might be the *Author and Efficient*, without being chargeable as the *Author of Sin*. And for his Fifth and last Objection, *That Criticsks distinguish betwixt $\lambda\upsilon\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha$, and $\nu\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\alpha\varsigma$, and say the latter is us'd for a Sacrifice, not the former*: I think we have already made the contrary sufficiently appear from the LXX. to whom he refers us. So that I see not what further can be pleaded against this Interpretation of the Text.

The same might be also pleaded in reference to the procurement of our Pardon, Mat. 26. 28. And the Holy Spirit, Heb. 10. 10, 14. — 13. 22. with *Eternal Salvation*, 1 Thess. 5. 9. 10. These are Blessings that we cou'd not have procur'd by our own dying (this, to Christians surely, I shall not need to prove): Now, if Christ died strictly *in our Person*, his death had signify'd no more than ours: A *Representative*, so far as he represents another, is in Law look'd upon no otherwise, than as that other whom He represents; whatever Excellencies he may otherwise have above that other, yet do they not come under Consideration here; as a *Representative*, He does but personate that other Man; and what He does or suffers as a Representative, is but the *same thing*, as if that other Man had done or suffer'd. So far as there is any difference allow'd in Law, 'tis plain the Law looks

looks upon 'em to be two distinct Persons; so far the one does not, cannot *Represent* the other. Either therefore these Benefits were not procur'd for us by the Sufferings of Christ, or He suffer'd otherwise than as our *Representative*, or in our mean and vile Person, *viz.* in the most highly dignify'd *Person of a Mediator*. To this Sense Mr. Baxter had pleaded long since, in the fore-cited *Treatise of Justifying Righteousness*, P. I. p. 96. "If Christ (says he) suffer'd but in the Person of sinful Man, his Sufferings wou'd have been in vain, or no Satisfaction to God, &c. See also Baxter's *Life of Faith*, p. 322. Thus therefore such a Representation of us by Christ, wou'd have been too little for us.

S. 18. But again, (2.) If the matter be consider'd under other respects, Christ's *strictly personating or representing* us in his Sufferings, would be too much for us. For (as we have before observ'd) betwixt a *Representative* and that other whom he *represents*, the Law makes no difference: Whatever the *Representative* does as a *Representative*, in the sense of the Law, that other does whom he represents.

(1.) If then Christ suffer'd *strictly* and properly in the *Person of Sinners*, or as their *Representative*, they did, in the account of the Law, suffer themselves; and whatever is the Moral Effect (*i. e.* whatever the

Law

Law under which Christ suffer'd (has annex'd, by Promise, as a Consequence) of his Suffering, it being the Effect of our Representative's Sufferings, may be attributed to us whom He did therein represent; whatever is in Scripture ascrib'd to the Sufferings of Christ, as an Effect of 'em, if He suffer'd in our Person, wou'd be to be ascrib'd to us: so we shou'd be our own *Redeemers*, our own *Saviours*, we shou'd have merited our own *Peace*, our own *Pardon*, &c. as truly as I pay Money, which one that in the strict Sense of the Law represents me, does pay in my Name; or Purchase Land, which my Legal Representative Purchases for me.

§. 19. (2.) If Christ had Suffered strictly in our Representative Person, we shou'd have had an *immediate and absolute right* to all the proper Results and Benefits of his Sufferings: Indeed, if Christ in his own Person, as *Mediator*, purchas'd these Blessings by Suffering for us, He may confer 'em on us at what time, in what measure, in what order, and upon what terms He pleases, as we find He does: But supposing Him to have been our proper Representative therein, our *Right* in Law, to all the Benefits of his Sufferings, wou'd have been *absolute* (as His now is) and have *immediately resulted* from his having so suffered; so as

that no place cou'd have been left for the introducing and imposing upon us any Terms or Conditions in order to our enjoying such Benefits : there cou'd be no room for such a Constitution afterwards, *if thou* [Sinner] *Repent, Believe in Christ, &c. thou shalt be saved* : For according to this Principle, *the Sinner* has purchas'd Salvation by the Sufferings of Christ [as *his Representative*] He has thereupon an absolute and present right to the Salvation so purchas'd ; to deny or suspend his right, or with-hold him from Possession, wou'd be *injurious* to Him, as keeping Him from that which is *his own* : How then will this consist with the *Justice of God*, who does not give Sinners immediately the full of what was purchas'd by the Sufferings of Christ ! God does not give 'em an immediate and absolute *Pardon*, present *freedom from all sin and sorrow*, present *possession of the Heavenly Inheritance* — If Sinners have an immediate *absolute right* to these Blessings, it wou'd be a wrong done to 'em, for God to keep 'em out of Possession as He does ; and such a Right we shou'd have, if He Suffer'd (strictly) as our Representative — So that this way consider'd, it does as much *exceed*, as the other way it *fell short of* Answering the Exigencies of our Case.

§. 20. And we may add, as a farther Consequent hereupon (3.) If Christ had Suffer'd (*strictly*) as the Representative Person of Sinners: (Indefinitely, as 'tis express'd) it wou'd follow, that every Sinner equally has a right to the fore-mention'd Benefits of Christ's Sufferings; why then have not all equally a Pardon? Why are not the Influences of the Divine Spirit equally diffus'd? Why are some (yea, even of the truly sanctify'd) more freed from Sin and Sorrow, than others? Some but *babes*, while others are *strong Men* in Christ. Nay, why are not all in Heaven (whom Christ did represent) as well as some there?

§. 21. Moreover (4.) If Christ had thus suffer'd as *our Representative* (and we had thus Satisfy'd and Merited in Him) what room would there have been left for *His Holiness and Obedience* to bestead us, or be of any advantage to us. We are most expressly assur'd, That by the Obedience of One (i. e. of Christ) we are made righteous, Rom. 5. 19. Suppose his Sufferings and Death to be included, as it cannot be deny'd, yet 'tis as they were instances of his Obedience, Phil. 2. 8. and (according to that known Rule, *a quatenus, ad omne valet consequentia*) if his Sufferings did meritoriously procure

our *Pardon, Peace, &c.* as they were instances of his Obedience to the Law of Mediation, then whatever was an instance of such Obedience, had an influence upon the same effect. His Habitual, Active and Passive Obedience, are therefore to be consider'd as one entire Meritorious Cause, one entire Purchasing Price of such Blessings. — But upon this Principle, *That Christ in suffering did strictly Personate, or Represent us,* where can his Habitual Holiness, and Active Obedience be taken in! what room is there for 'em! what need is there of 'em! when we have merited a *Pardon, acceptance with God, Eternal Salvation* already, by the Sufferings of Christ as our Representative; what further need can we have of his Obeying for us?

Or shall we say, That He was our Representative, in his Obeying, as well as in his Suffering? So indeed our Accusation would have it, in his Defence, P. 28. Christ (says he) *thus Suffering and Obeying in the Person of Sinners,* it is, to all intents and purposes, as Effectual, as if they did it themselves. But besides, that these two Parts of the Assertion are inconsistent with each other, had He Obeyed in our Person, He needed not to have Suffer'd in our Person; or had He Suffer'd in our Person, He needed not so to have Obey'd. I say, besides that, the Notion car-

ries

ries a manifest Inconsistence in it — If it were admitted, it would infer all those Seven Absurdities mention'd in the fore-going Chapter, with many more, that I cannot now stay to mention.

§. 22. In a Word then, since his *strict Representing*, or *Personating* us, would intimate, That Christ and we are, *in the Sense of the Law*, but one Person; and thereupon his Suffering in our Person (our Representative Person, properly so call'd) would intimate either that He (in his Sufferings) was (in the esteem of God and the Law) depress'd to the mean, and vile, and sinful State of us, *whom He did Represent*; or else that we are (in the account of God and the Law) exalted to the Dignity and Perfection of his State *who Represented us*; and neither of these are to be admitted. *Not the former*, for that it would render Christ's Sufferings unavailable to the great purposes that were to be serv'd of 'em; *not the latter*, for the Reasons last mention'd: It follows, That He cannot (otherwise than very improperly, and with great Limitations) be said to have Suffer'd in the Person (the Representative Person) of Sinners.

C H A P. III.

*That Christ's Sufferings were only
Materially, not Formally the
same we were oblig'd to.*

THIS our Accuser charges also upon us, as a Branch of that *Design*, that Plot he impeaches us of; a *Socinian Plot*, a Plot, to introduce *Socinianism*: That we have such a *Design*, he once and again insinuates, and thereupon Brands us as *Episcopalians*, *Socinianizing Arminians*, &c. He had signify'd his Apprehensions, his fears of a *Design* against the *Doctrine of a Real, Full, and Proper Satisfaction to God's Justice for our Sins*, P. 4. but by that time we are got to the 12th. Page, those Surmizes are improv'd into clear Evidence, he is now aware of the *Design*; nay, twice together we are told it, to intimate (no doubt) that he is thoroughly aware.

aware of it; and to make Proof of it, he does alledge, amongst other Matters, That (according to us) *Christ's Sufferings were the same we were oblig'd to, only Materially, and not Formally.* Now the *Design* he suggests, is what we do from our Souls abhor; and if this Accuser were himself a *Socinian*, he could no way more effectually serve their Interests, than by persuading the World (as he here endeavours) That all must be *Socinians*, at least *Socinianize*, that are not *Antinomians*.

Sect. 2. But for the Principle he charges upon us, we are not asham'd to own it; and cannot but wonder, that our Accuser should never once attempt to prove the contrary; it lying upon him here again, as being the Affirmer, to produce his Evidence: Surely this, *That Christ's Sufferings were Formally the same we were oblig'd to*, is not to be reckon'd amongst those Propositions which carry their own Light along with 'em, and engage our Assent at the first Hearing: Why then has he only mention'd our denial of it, as if that alone, were sufficient to expose us to the severest Censures.

Sect. 3. But we cannot satisfie our selves (though we be on the *Negative Part*) to deny, and Dispute against Words that have *no meaning*, or (which is, in Effect, the same thing) Words that have an *un-agreed and uncertain one*: And therefore though he has not told us *his meaning*, we shall, with greatest plainness, tell him, and the World, *ours*; that it may be understood what we intend, when we deny, *That Christ's Sufferings were Formally the same we were oblig'd to.*

Sect. 4. Now there are two Things that (we apprehend) may be meant, when 'tis Asserted, *That Christ's Sufferings were not only Materially, but also Formally the same we were oblig'd to*, viz: Either that they were not only in a more loose and *general* way of Speaking, but strictly and *fully the same kind* of Sufferings that we were oblig'd to: Or, also it may intimate, That they were not only the *same kind* of Sufferings, but even the *very same thing* in Law, as if we our selves had Suffer'd. And the former of these we dare not admit, much less the latter.

Sect. 4.

Sect. 5. 1. Not the former, viz. That Christ's Sufferings were *strictly and fully of the same kind* with those we were oblig'd to. That they were not, could not be so, I think was sufficiently made appear, Chap. I. Sect. 5. of this Discourse. And Mr. Baxter has yet more distinctly and fully clear'd it, by an Enumeration of several Particulars, in which his were not the same with ours, under these Three Heads;

I. *Christus nullas tulit penas, quæ etiam peccata sunt.*

II. *Nullas tales penas dedit, quæ sunt tantum naturalia peccandi consequentia.*

III. *Nullas Deus ipse penas in Christum infliccit, quæ ex displicentia (adversus Christum scil.) vel amoris diminutione aliqua proveniunt. Vid. Method. Theol. P. III. Cap. 1. Disp. 4. P. 36, 37.*

Sect. 6. 2. Much less can we agree to it in the *Latter Sense*, as it intimates, That Christ's Sufferings were the *Idem*, the very same thing in *Law*, as if we our selves had Suffer'd; for that this it could not be, unless He Suffer'd (most strictly) in *our Person*; and that too, by *virtue of the Law*, which we had Transgress'd: Both which have been

been abundantly Disprov'd by us in the Fore-going Chapters. What has been there alledg'd against the one, or the other of those Errors, may also have place here again. To which I shall only add;

1. The Inconsistency hereof with the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction. For if Christ's Sufferings should be allow'd to be *strictly the same thing* that the Law oblig'd to, then they could not be a *Satisfaction* for our Non-Payment, but would themselves have been the *proper Payment*: Now these two things are vastly differing, to *pay a Debt*; and to offer some-what instead of Payment, that is accepted as *Satisfaction* for Non-Payment. Since the Word [*Satisfaction*] was borrow'd from the Civilians, from them it is that the Import of it may be best understood; And they do carefully distinguish betwixt *Solutio* and *Satisfaction*. *Solutio* is when the very same thing is paid, to which the Law oblig'd. So *Vinnius*,

In Notis ad Justini. — *Solutio*, specialiter accepta, denotat *Instit. Tit. naturalem præstationem ejus quod debetur.* 30. p. (mi-
hi) 494. Which is agreeable to the account *Grotius*

gives us of it, with whom *Solutio stricte sumpta*, is *Solutio rei plane ejusdem, quæ erat in obligatione*; *Solutio rei ipsius debitæ*. Now *De Satisf.* this, as the Bishop of Worcester tells us, in *p. 123, 126* the Sense of the Law is never call'd Satisfaction, but *strict Payment*. This is what cannot be

refus'd, when offer'd in Payment. But Christ's Sufferings might have been refus'd: God was not oblig'd to accept of them, but might have insisted upon the Sufferings of Sinners themselves. Therefore Grotius tells of another sort of *Solution*, *cum aliud, quam quod in obligatione est, Solvitur*. When some-what else, and not strictly that which the Law requir'd, is paid; and this, if accepted, is peculiarly call'd *Satisfaction*. *Talis autem solutio* (says he) *quæ aut admitti, aut recusari potest, admissa; in Jure, speciale* Ib. p. 124. *habet nomen Satisfactionis; quæ interdum Solutioni strictus sumptæ opponitur*. So that by a *Satisfaction*, 'tis plain they intend a *valuable Consideration* offer'd instead of what was due, which the Creditor in Pecuniary (and the Rector in Criminal) Cases, may accept or refuse at pleasure. Under this Notion do the greatest and best of our Divines maintain the Doctrine of Christ's *Satisfaction*, in Opposition to the *Socinian* Adversaries; nor can it be Defended upon any other bottom. To make the Controversie betwixt the *Socinians* and *Us* (in the Point of *Satisfaction*) to be not (as it has been wont to be stated) whether Christ's Sufferings were an *Equivalent* (a valuable Consideration) offer'd and accepted, instead of what was due from us to Divine Justice; so far as that upon account thereof, we have Reconciliation, Pardon, and Eternal Salvation,

in

in the Order, and upon the Terms of the Gospel? I say, to make the Question in difference, not to be what is above-said, but whether *Christ's Sufferings be the very same thing, the All, that the Law requir'd, oblig'd to, the very Execution of its Threatning?* How plainly is this to betray the Cause into their Hands!

If the Bishop of Worcester has any Judgment in this Controversie (and while the Learned World has so universally approv'd what he has wrote in it, they can't themselves be thought to have much, that deny, or doubt his thorow Acquaintance with it; and of all Men living, our Accuser, who has *appeal'd* to him, surely does not suspect it; I say, if that Right Reverend Person has any insight into this Matter) the *Socinian* Cause can scarcely any way be more effectually befriended, than by such as pretending to be their Adversaries, do thus State our Controversie with 'em: For with these remarkable Words does he close up his most Convincing Reasonings against *Christ's Sufferings having been the very same thing which the Law requir'd*: "When (says he) our Adversaries (meaning the *Soci-*
 " *nians*) Dispute against this Opinion, no
 " wonder if they do it successfully; but
 " this whole Opinion is built upon a Mi-
 " stake, that Satisfaction must be the Pay-
 " ment

" ment of the very same; which while
 " they Contend for, they give our Enemies
 " too great an advantage, and make 'em
 " think they triumph over the Faith of the *Discourse*
 " Church, when they do it only over the *of the suf-*
 " Mistake of some particular Persons. *ferings of*
Christ, P.
 17.

2. Neither could the Sufferings of Christ
 be *strictly* (and individually) *the same thing*
 that the Law threatened; for it threatened the
 Death of the Offenders themselves: *In the*
day Thou eatest, Thou shalt die, Gen. 2. 17.

The same Individual that sinneth, shall die:

Thus does the Prophet express it, *The Soul*
that sinneth, it (that very Soul) shall die,
 Ezek. 18. 4. *The*

very sinning soul it self, that very soul shall die.

The Seal of the Holy Ghost could not have
 been more fully expressed to this purpose.

And so also the Apostle, *Gal. 3. 10. Cursed*
is every one that continues not, &c. *His*

denounc'd against no one but the Sinner
 himself? since then the Law mentions no

Surety or Substitute; the Sufferings of Christ
 could not be the Execution of its threatening,

unless He was *the very Soul that sinned, that*
very Individual Soul.

And

And hence we may be assisted in that only Difficulty, with which our Accuser (at the second hand) does seem to press us: For in the Passage he quotes from his Brother *Ferguson*, (P. 5.) amongst other Attributes of GOD that were to influence the Grand Affair of our Redemption, he mentions the *Divine Veracity*: *God's Truth* (as that Gentleman says) and his *Immutability* must be evidenced in proceeding according to the *Penal Law* He had at first Enacted. And this being presuppos'd, he would naturally enough infer, That *Man* (having sinn'd) could not be receiv'd into favour, but in such a way as might evidence that *Truth of God*, &c. Now indeed, if the *Truth and Immutability* of GOD did require, that He should proceed (exactly) according to the *Penal Law* He had Enacted, it must be granted then, That *Christ's* sufferings could not otherwise bestead us, then as being the very Execution of that *Penal Law*, the very Penalty therein threatned.

And this Objection I shall the rather take notice of, because (whatever Character our Accuser, and this Brother of his deserv'd) I find some of greatest Name (and deservedly too) both for Learning and Piety, speak as if they did apprehend, That the *Truth of GOD* did engage Him to Execute the

Interest of
Reason in
Religion, p.
336.

the Threatned Penalty; that unless the Punishment due by that Law had been inflicted, his Veracity could not have been Justified.

But (how much soever I reverence the Names of some that speak thus) I dare not agree, out of respect to any Man, so far to expose the *Veracity* of the Holy GOD, as to suspend it upon any thing that is *not certainly True*, much less upon what is *evidently untrue*.

1. Supposing it only to be *uncertain*, whether He was oblig'd formally to Execute the Threatning of that Law, 'tis no way fit the *Veracity* of God should be suspended upon an Uncertainty: May I not be sure that GOD is true, though I were not sure, that his Threatning must needs be executed?

2. And especially, when we have full and clear Evidence, That He has not Executed that Threatning; we should surely be afraid to say, His Truth oblig'd Him to Execute it; He has falsify'd his Word in Not-Executing it. Though we could not see which way GOD's *Veracity* could be reconcil'd with the *Non-Execution* of his Threatning; yet when He has Relax'd or Dispens'd with his Threatning (as in this Case He manifestly has) we may be assur'd, it is not inconsistent

sistent with his Truth. The Law threatened the Delinquent himself, and every Delinquent; another (who was no Delinquent) dies for us: Here is not then an Execution of the Threatning; is the Truth of GOD therefore violated? GOD forbid. Yet had his *Truth* oblig'd Him to inflict the Threatned Penalty at all, it would as well have oblig'd Him to inflict it on the Offenders themselves. That GOD has inflicted Death for Sin, is not therefore because of his Truth, but for other Reasons that have been already hinted. And this is that which does difference *Threatnings* from *Predictions*: That *Threatnings* do only constitute the dueness of Punishment, and make the Offender obnoxious, without determining certainly whether (eventually) it shall be inflicted, or not; but *Predictions* do primarily respect a certain Event. So that the Truth of GOD is indeed concern'd to accomplish a *Prediction*; but not to execute a *Threatning*; a meer *Threatning* does only render the Transgressor liable to suffer, but GOD is afterwards at liberty to inflict, or not inflict the Penalty incurr'd, as his *Wisdom* shall see fit; indeed if a *Prediction* should also be added to the Threatning, GOD's Word is then past for its Execution, and his *Truth* obliges Him accordingly — They that are otherwise Opinionated in this Matter, may do well to consider, which

which way the *Veracity* of GOD (upon their Hypothesis) can possibly be maintain'd: *When the Law was at first given to Adam* (as our Accuser himself expressly owns) *Christ was not in its obligation; it did not run* [Thou, or thy Surety for thee.] Hereupon the after-admission of a Surety, and the Transferring our Punishment upon Him (supposing He had undergone, as far as was possible, the same that we should) was an Act of *Sovereign-Dispensing-Power*: The Threatning was so far relax'd, or dispens'd with; not Executed. But if GOD had engag'd his Word (by an absolute Prediction) to punish the Offender, there had been no place for a Dispensation; In that case, as indeed in every case where the Divine Truth is concern'd, the Event will infallibly, and in every respect be answerable to what GOD has fore-declared. Since therefore the Event did not answer in this case, *the very sinning Soul it self did not die*, but *Christ* for him, it must be concluded, That this was not a Prediction of what *eventually* should be, but a meer Threatning of what *legally* might be inflicted; importing only what the *Sinner was oblig'd* to undergo, not what *GOD was oblig'd* to lay upon him. And there-

fore his *Truth* was no way violated, though Christ's Sufferings were not strictly the same Thing that the Law threatned. To which I might add,

3. That if Christ's Sufferings had been *the very same thing* that the Law requir'd, we must thereupon, *ipso facto*, have enjoy'd present and perfect Deliverance; if the *Idem*, the *all* (and that it must needs be, if it was the *same*) that the Law threatned, was endur'd in the Sufferings of Christ, what further Penalty could remain upon us? Justice it self could require no more than the *Idem quod debetur*. To this purpose the Lear-

Grotius de
Satisfact.
Cap. 6. P.
(mibi) 123

P. 126.

ned Grotius speaks, *Ipso facto liberat, solutio rei plane ejusdem, quæ erat in obligatione*. Upon which account he does determine, That the Death of Christ was not *Solutio rei ipsius debitæ*. And so also that very Judicious and Right Reverend Person (the Bishop of Worcester) to whom this Accuser has Appeal'd, does not only deny, but does also very largely and nervously disprove, *Christ's Sufferings to have been the very same that the Law requir'd*; we shall only transcribe what he offers to the purpose we are Arguing upon — "If (says he) the very same had been paid in the strict
" Sense

Discourse
of the suf-
ferings of
Christ, P.

“ Sense, there would have follow’d a
 “ Deliverance *ipso facto*; for the Re-
 “ lease immediately follows the Pay-
 “ ment of the *same*; and it had been In-
 “ justice to have requir’d any thing fur-
 “ ther, in order to the Discharge of
 “ the Offender, when strict and full
 “ Payment had been made of what was
 “ in the Obligation. But we see that
 “ Faith and Repentance, and the Con-
 “ sequences of those two, are made Con-
 “ ditions on our parts, in order to the
 “ enjoying the Benefit of what Christ
 “ has procur’d; so that the Release is
 “ not immediate upon the Payment, but
 “ depends on a *New Contract*, made in
 “ consideration of what Christ has done
 “ and suffer’d for us. This is but a
 small part of his most clear and invin-
 cible Arguings *against Christ’s Paying* (in
 his Sufferings) *the very same* that we
 were to have paid. And therefore we
 add,

4. Had Christ’s Sufferings been *the*
very same thing that the Law threatned,
 there had been, there cou’d have been
 no such thing as *Pardon*; we must have
 been discharg’d, set at liberty as before;
 but we could not afterwards have been
 said to be Pardon’d. To remit a Debt

or Penalty, is a Phrase that is never us'd but in reference to such from whom the one or other was due; and does import a *Gracious Discharge* of a Person (either in whole, or in part) from what in Justice might have been requir'd. The Civilians therefore explain it by *Relaxatio, Indulgentia, &c.* And this is most manifestly the import of the *Greek Term* [*χαεζιδας*]. Proper *Remission* that cannot be, that is not an Act of Grace and Favour, but what in strict Justice we are oblig'd to. Therefore *Grotius* does accurately distinguish betwixt *Liberation* and *Remission*; allowing (as he needs must) That all *Remission* is a *Liberation*, or *Discharge*; but not that every *Discharge* is or may be so call'd, *Remission*: The Law it self does of course acquit and *discharge* a Person (Debtor or Criminal) that fully answers its Obligation; but when a *Discharge* is granted, by the Rector or Creditor, out of *meer Pleasure*, to one that according to the Rigour of the Law could not lay claim to it, here is proper *Remission*. *Ubi idem Solvitur* (scil. quod debetur) *aut a Debitore, aut ab alio, nomine debitoris, nulla contingit Remissio*—— *Si quis poenam pertulerit quam debet, Liberatio hic erit; Remissio non erit. Remitti aliquid recte*

recte dicitur, etiam ubi solutio accedit, sed talis quæ sine actu voluntatis vim non habeat pariendæ liberationis. Where there *ib. p. 133.*
 is a Payment of what was owing, there is no Remission, no place for Forgiveness; the *quondam* Debtor or Criminal now needs it not, nor can the Creditor or Rector be said to have granted it; the same Debt cannot be both Paid and Forgiven. "It is impossible (as the Bishop of Worcester further urges) to reconcile the *freeness of Remission*, with the *full payment of the very same*, which was in the Obligation. *ib. p. 16.*

Sect. 7. For the close therefore of this Head, let it be consider'd; That Mr. Baxter (in that very Book to which our Accuser refers us) thus Explains the Question before us: "It is not (says he) *de materia debiti* that we enquire, but *de forma*; whether it was the same *formally* which we ow'd, and the obligation requir'd? Or, only the *value*, and not the same full Debt? Also, you must know, That though we may well use the Word [Debt] In this case, because the Scripture does, yet we must acknowledge it but a Metaphor, and the proper Terms are, whether Christ's Sufferings are the *same thing*

G 3

Bax. of
Universal
Redempt.
p. 79.

“ thing that the Law in its Threatning re-
 “ quir’d, i. e. oblig’d to, and made due;
 “ and so a fulfilling of that Threatning?
 “ and this with great Aversness he
 “ does (and very justly sure) deny.
 Now therefore if our Accuser will not
 own Christ’s Sufferings to be *formally the*
same we were oblig’d to, in the Sense in
 which Mr. Baxter denied it, why does
 he quarrel with him? If he will, ’tis but
 reasonable to expect, he should either
 disown and disprove the Doctrine of
Satisfaction, of *Pardon of Sin*, &c. Or,
 else make it appear, we have not justly
 charg’d these Consequences upon him.

CHAP. IV.

That though our Sins were the Impulsive, Meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings, yet it was only more Remotely that they were so; and not so nearly and immediately as they would have been of our own.

§. 1. **S**ince our Accuser bears so hard upon this Point, and seems most plausibly from hence to insinuate his Spiteful and Unchristian Surmizes of us, I shall endeavour with all the Freedom and Plainness possible, to deliver our Thoughts about this Matter; that it may appear what we Deny, and what we Own; and that herein we do not in the least vary from the *Common Faith of Christians*, or make the least Approaches towards the *Socinian Tents*.

Sect. 2. We do therefore distinguish (in reference to the Controversie, Whether our Sins were the Meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings) betwixt the Name, and the Thing intended by it; as every one surely will do, that does not prefer *Strife* before *Truth*. If we can agree in this, or other Controversies, in *Sense*, *Words* are not worthy of a Contention on either side: 'Tis strange that what the Apostle has said of such Contentions, that just account he has given of their so base *Original*, and sad *Effects*, should not Awe the Spirits of all (at least) that make any Pretensions to the *Christian Name*, 1 Tim. 6. 4. For (according to the Order in which the Apostle has plac'd it) this *doting about Questions*, that are but a *strife of words*, a [*λογομαχία*] does presuppose the Person to be *Proud*, puff'd up with *Arrogance* and *Self-Conceit*, as the Word imports; and withal *extreamly Ignorant*, *μὴδὲν ἔνσδυνος*, one that knows nothing, that has no Skill, no Judgment, one that has never Penetrated into Things, that has look'd no further than their outside; and therefore is he so exceeding Sollicitous about *Words*, for that he is acquainted with nothing more valuable

able about which to be concern'd; he is sick, nay, he does *insanire*, if his Word may not be allow'd [such a Sense the Term *recor* seems to carry in it]. Neither are the *Effects* of this *Logomachy* less fruitful; thereof (as the Apostle adds) cometh *envy, strife, railings, evil-surmizings, perverse disputings, megalomachias*, such as are nothing to the purpose, that can serve no good End. I wou'd requite all this Accuser's hard Speeches of us, with a serious Admonition that he wou'd carefully look into the Text last mention'd, and if to that he adds, what does occur, in *The Carnality of Religious Contentions*, p. 39, 40, 41, 42. (*A Treatise well worthy of its most excellent Author.*) Perhaps, it may minister towards the Cure of his so sickly Mind; and he may not hereafter so far dote upon an Unscriptural Word or Phrase, or turn it to our Reproach, that we are not alike fond of 'em.

Sect. 3. But to proceed, We challenge this Accuser to instance any one particular thing plainly intended by the Orthodox (*Grotius*, the Bishop of Worcester, &c.) that use this Phrase against the *Socinians*; I say, Let him instance (if he be able) any one thing they intend

tend by it, that is not readily agreed to by us. We have reason to suppose, That he himself may intend some-what more by it, than we are willing to allow (and which in due place may be taken notice of): But we cannot find that they thereby design (in general) to express any thing more, than that *the Sufferings of Christ had a respect to sin, to our sins, as the ground or reason of 'em; they were the assumed Cause of 'em; He suffer'd for, or on the account of our sins.* Now, whereas it may be difficult to conceive how, or which way our Sins cou'd influence his Sufferings in such sort, as that He shou'd be said to suffer for our sins, to *die for our sins*: What they say for the clearing this Relation that our Sins had to the Sufferings of Christ, as an *Antecedent, procuring Cause* (for we meddle not now with the other Respect they bear to 'em as a *final Cause*; though He also suffer'd for our Sins, so as in a proper Sense to Expiate, and make Atonement for 'em) I say, the whole of what they offer, for the clearing the Relation our Sins had to Christ's Sufferings, as their Antecedent Procuring Cause, may (so far as I have yet observ'd) be reduc'd to the following particulars, *viz.*

Sect. 4. 1. *Our Sins*, both in the nature of the Thing, and according to the Constitution of the Divine Law, *deserv'd Death*, Eternal Death, *Rom. 1. 32.* This was what they had render'd *our Due*; they were (in the strictest and most proper Sense) *Meritorious* of our own Sufferings. Had we lain Eternally under the Avenging Wrath of GOD, it cou'd not have been said, with Truth, that He had done us any wrong; it wou'd have been but *the Wages* we had earn'd, *Rom. 6. 23.* And what Apostate Angels do actually undergo.

II. Hereupon (Death being the demerit of our Sin) it follows, *That we must of necessity suffer, unless we be forgiven*; for no one (surely) will, or can imagine, That it might be avoided by our own Power or Policy (whether alone, or in Conjunction with any other Creature, or Creatures): Is it possible we shou'd either hide from GOD's *All-seeing Eye*, or prevail against his *All-powerful Hand*? We cannot therefore escape against, or without the *Divine Pleasure*. Now, a Liberation, a Deliverance from deserved Wrath, that does depend upon, and derivè from the *Divine Will* and Pleasure,

sure, is most *Proper Remission*, as has been before said. And, how is to be conceiv'd, that the Miseries which the Law threatned, and we had deserv'd by our Sins, cou'd otherwise possibly be avoid-ed, than by vertue of such an interve-ning Act of the Divine Will, whereby the Penalty is graciously remitted.

III. Several things* concurr'd to ren-der it *unmeet*, that *G O D* (should *meerly Pardon*; that He should so forgive the *Sinner*, as not to leave (one way or other) any severe marks of his displea-sure upon *sin*. He did retain (in the heighth of his Displeasure) such a *Love of Benevolence*, as did incline Him to commiserate the case of lapsed, sinful Man; and (in some besitting way) to re-admit him into favour. But it was highly fit and necessary, it shou'd be in such a way as shou'd both duly provide for the Honour of *G O D*, and be most apt to deter and affright Men from sin-nig. Due regard must be had to both these; the Sinner cou'd not be forgiven, unless (consistently therewith) the Ho-nour of *G O D* cou'd be secur'd, and sin render'd frightful, and to be dreaded by us. Now in reference to

The *Former*; the *Honour of God* did require, That if He Pardon Sinners, it shou'd be in such a way, as shou'd manifestly vindicate and acquit Him, from the Reflections that are not uncommon upon such occasions. 'Tis a very usual and known case, in Humane Governments, that the Sovereign's Reputation suffers by too easie Pardons: In the case before us, it is exceeding plain, That the Honour of GOD's *Power and Wisdom*, but specially of his *Holiness and Justice*, were to be provided for; whilst He magnify'd his *Mercy* in our Forgiveness.

1. Whereas nothing is more common, than for too *easie Pardons* to be imputed to a Governour, as an Evidence of his *Weakness* and want of Power; it was a most condecant and becoming thing, That GOD should Pardon in such a way, as yet shou'd manifest his *Power*; that it might appear, He was not afraid, or *unable* to vindicate his injur'd Law; That He did not forgive, through a meer want of Power to punish.

2. It

2. It was equally fit and necessary, That He should also vindicate the Honour of his *Wisdom*, and not by a light and easie Pardon tempt the World to impeach Him of Levity and Folly; as if He had rashly and unadvisedly made a Law, of the Consequences whereof He was not aware; and therefore was afterwards oblig'd to change his mind, and indemnifie the Transgressors, without any Compensation.

3. Yea, a meer Pardon would also have reflected upon his *Holiness*; it was therefore necessary that GOD (for the Vindication of his Essential Purity) shou'd make it appear, that He *hated sin*, though He *lov'd the Sinner*; that Men might not look upon Him to be a GOD *that has pleasure in Iniquity* (the direct contrary to what He has declar'd of Himself, *Psal. 5. 4.*) neither yet, as if He was indifferently affected towards it. He is (as we are assur'd) of *purser Eyes than to behold Iniquity*, i. e. So as to allow, or not to be displeas'd at it, *Hab. 1. 13.* This *Holiness* of his, is that which gives a most adorable and conspicuous Beauty and Lustre to all his other Perfections, *He is Glorious in Holiness, Exod.*

15. 11. And therefore it cou'd be no way meet, that the Honour of this Attribute should be neglected, or *post-pon'd* to our safety: 'Twere better that Ten Thousand Worlds should perish, than that the Glory of GOD's Holiness be stain'd: But how shall it be vindicated, if Sin be absolutely remitted! That Connexion we find betwixt *his Holiness*, and *his not forgiving sin*, *Josh. 24. 19.* does very plainly intimate, That the Holiness of God is a Bar that lies in the way of Pardon, that does (as it were) oblige GOD not to give out Pardons too easily; not to Pardon absolutely, or without due Provision made for the demonstrating his Antipathy against Sin; that in his Eye (as well as in its own nature) 'tis an abominable *thing*, what his Soul hates, *Jer. 44. 4.*

4. It was further necessary, That the Reputation of his *Governing Justice*, shou'd also be consulted. GOD (consider'd as a Governour) is necessarily *just*, cannot but be so: How monstrous a sound wou'd these two Words conjoyn'd carry in 'em [*an unjust GOD!*] they do mutually destroy and subvert each other; He that is GOD cannot be unjust; and that Being that is *unjust*, for that very reason cannot

cannot possibly be GOD. Now this Justice of GOD, not only has place in the conferring *Promised Rewards*, but also in the executing *threatned Penalties*: Of the *former*, no one makes a doubt; 'tis the *latter* therefore that only needs to be clear'd: And how plain is it that even the Punishment of Sin is still mention'd as an Act of Justice, *Rom. 3. 8.* — *2. 5. 2 Theff. 1. 6. Heb. 2. 2. Rev. 16. 5. 7.* — *19. 2.* But though in the nature of the thing, and from these Texts it is most evident, That when GOD punishes Sin, He does it justly; it may yet be a doubtful Case with some, *Whether, or how far his Justice obliges Him to punish it?* And that it does oblige Him in some Cases, surely shou'd be agreed; for that we cannot form a Notion of *Rectoral Justice*, that does not import and carry in it a difference betwixt the *Righteous* and the *Wicked* in its *Distributions*; it will not admit, that all be alike treated: The *Wise Man* therefore complains of this, as one of the great Evils of our World, That *there be Righteous Men* to whom it happens according to the work of the *Wicked*, and *wicked Men* to whom it happens according to the work of the *Righteous*, *Eccles. 8. 14.* But is certain it shall not (at last) be well with 'em,

v. 13.

v. 13. GOD has declar'd this *Justifying the Wicked in Humane Judicatures, to be an abomination to Him*, Prov. 17. 19. and has accordingly denounc'd a *Woe* against it, *Isa. 5. 23.* and therefore surely it can have no place with Him. Besides that in reference to Himself, we are assur'd, that He is *no Respector of Persons* in Judgment, *Rom. 2. 11.* which Text is the more considerable, for that the Apostle does there alledge this as an Argument to Evince, That GOD will render to every man according to his works, and thereby manifest his Judgment to be Righteous, v. 5. 6. Intimating that his Justice does consist therein, *viz. In rendering to every one according to his works*; his Justice obliges Him thereto: Now, that we may not mistakingly imagine, that He intends it only of the good that is their due, He carefully distinguishes betwixt Good and bad, and applies this Exercise of Justice to both——Not only will He (as Justice obliges Him) render glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, but also (as the same Justice obliges) tribulation and anguish upon every Soul of Man that does evil, ver. 9. 10. Not upon one, or two, but every one; for there is no respect of persons with GOD. And (to give this yet the greater force)

H

we

we find it conjoyn'd with the denial of any Iniquity in GOD, 2 Chron. 19. 7. There is no iniquity with the Lord our God, nor respect of persons. Signifying thereby, That shou'd GOD (as a Ruler) deal unequally with Persons, whose cases are the same; or deal alike with Persons, whose cases are differing (either of which ways there would be a *Manifestation*, a *Respect of Persons*) He wou'd be chargeable with Iniquity: 'Tis as certain therefore that GOD cannot but severely Animadvert upon Sin, as that there can be no Iniquity in Him. But what need we further Proof, while Gressius himself owns it, That the Justice of God in some cases oblige Him to punish. *Nec illud negamus, relictitudinem ac justitiam Dei, nonnunquam eum ad peccata punienda movere, eorum nempe, &c. — Quales sunt homines non-resipiscentes, atq; in peccatis contumaciter perseverantes, &c. — Maxime, si ipsum peccati Genus in quo persistunt, insignem animi malitiam, aut apertum Divinae Majestatis contemptum spectet.* And he not only grants this (which yet, as we may hereafter make appear, does plainly infer the whole of what he had been pleading against) but he does also nervously prove it in the immediately following Words, *Si enim*
hujus-

hujusmodi hominibus venia concederetur, facile supremi Rectoris Majestas (ex qua Ordo Universitatis pendet;) & Legum, ab Croll. Resp. ipso latarum, Autoritas evanesceret; & ad Grot. gloria ipsius, quæ præcipuus operum ejus finis Cap. 1. §. est, minueretur. To the same purpose he 78. p. (mis- bi) 98. speaks again: Non resipiscentes parva non liberare — Positis quibusdam finibus quos C. 2. §. 29. Deus sibi in regendis hominibus prescribit, factu p. 198. necessarium, &c.

Now upon these Concessions of Crollius, it may be inferr'd, That supposing GOD to rule us by his Laws, we must conceive of Him as necessarily oblig'd to punish the Impenitent; But, why is He so necessitated to punish? That the Honour of his Majesty, and the Authority of his Law may be maintain'd: And that Principle (as we may call it) that in God which obliges Him for these Ends to punish the Impenitent, the Contumacious, he allows to be his Justice: Now therefore if Crollius will consist with himself, I think he needs must own, that unless GOD Govern the World so, as to attain the great Ends of Government, he would not be Just; and that those Ends cannot be attain'd, unless Sin be punish'd, will easily be made appear, if any one shou'd make a doubt of it; but the

the further Consideration of this, is more properly to be reserv'd, till we meet with it in the Second Part of this Discourse.

In the mean time, let it be observ'd, how far we have proceeded; and these things seem to be very plain, *viz.* That GOD is (in a most proper Sense) the *Governour* of Intelligent Creatures; That (as such) He is most necessarily *Just*; That his Justice does respect the Distribution of *Rewards and Punishments*, and that however in Reference either to Rewards or Punishments, it may not always oblige Him to execute strictly what the very Letter of the Law imports; yet will it not admit, either in reference to the one or other, of any such Relaxation or Change, as wou'd not well consist with, and secure the great Ends of Threatnings or Promises. This *Governing Justice* therefore was a further Bar in the way of a meer Pardon; GOD could not (consistently herewith) absolutely Pardon: If the *very Penalty threatned* be not inflicted, *Justice* it self requir'd that an *Equivalent* should, *i. e.* such Sufferings as should as well attain the ends of the Law, as the threatned Penalty it self should. Thus,
in

in respect of GOD, his *Honour*, the Honour of his *Power*, *Wisdom*, *Holiness*, and *Governing Justice*, did necessarily require, that if GOD Pardon the Sinner, He should yet (one way or other) leave such marks of his displeasure upon *Sin*, as shou'd as effectually support the Authority, and secure the Ends of his Government, as if the Sinner himself had suffer'd according to the utmost rigour of the Law. And in reference also,

To the *Latter* Thing mention'd, *i. e.* That we be discourag'd and affrighted from Sinning; in order thereto, it was alike necessary, that Sin shou'd with great Severity be animadverted on; if no Punishment was inflicted, or none proportion'd to the Offence, what shou'd keep the World in awe, or make 'em afraid of Sinning yet again? Crimes unpunish'd are too much countenanc'd at least, if they be not thereby authoriz'd. We see the *meer delay* of Punishment is very frequently abus'd to this purpose, *Eccles. 8. 11. Because Sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in 'em to do evil.* And if meer Forbearance have this effect, what (may we suppose) wou'd have been the consequence of ab-

Solute Forgiveness? So that we conclude GOD could not (consistently with either his own Honour, or our Safety) Pardon Sin without a Satisfaction, it was necessary that Sufferings should be insisted on, and such Sufferings as should be *Equivalent* to what was Threatned, Sufferings that were adapted to answer the ends of the Law and Government, as well, or better than the Sufferings of Sinners themselves. Hereupon,

IV. In order to our Remission, the *Sufferings of Christ* were insisted on by the Father, and agreed to by the Son; by his Sufferings it was effected, brought to pass, that Sin might be remitted, without either reflecting any Dishonour upon GOD, or (in the least) encouraging any to Sin. His Sufferings did fully answer all the Exigencies of our Case; and therefore this Constitution is mention'd by the Apostle as a very *con-
decent and becoming one*, Heb. 2. 10. Supposing so Gracious an Intendment towards us, That GOD design'd to put us into the Hand of Christ, that He might bring us to Glory, it was what well became God, to make the Captain of our Salvation perfect through Sufferings. But what

what Condecency or Becomingness would there have been in it, if Sin might have been pardon'd, and the Sinner sav'd as well without it? Nay, the Death of Christ was therefore insisted on, that thereby GOD's Justice might be demonstrated, *Rom. 3. 25.* as *Indignus* is *merito* to *indignum* the *deum* *indignus* *deus*: tis doubled to give it the greater Emphasis, GOD would have been Just, and sufficiently have demonstrated himself to be so, if He had inflicted upon us the Vengeance that was threatned: but supposing that He Pardon us, that He Justify Sinners (though Penitent Believers) his Justice might well be call'd in Question, unless Satisfaction be first made for our Sins: therefore does the Apostle so industriously urge and inculcate this over and over, as what he would not, by any means, have overlooked — Christ therefore was a Propitiatory Sacrifice, that GOD's Justice might be demonstrated, that it might clearly be demonstrated to the World; and the next Words rise yet higher, *ut et deum digne* *deum* *deum*, that He might be (and not only that He might appear to be the) Just, as if upon the supposal of his Justifying Sinners, He could not otherwise be Just. So that though meer Remission would have well

consisted with *Mercy* alone; or the Damnation of all Apostate Sinners with *Justice* alone; yet if *GOD* would be merciful to Sinners, He must also be Just; and that He cou'd not be, unless He so far, and in such a way punish Sin, as will suffice to keep up his own Honour and Authority, and effectually to discourage Sin: And hence it was that Christ became the Propitiation for our Sins.—Wherefore,

V. And in the last place, The Sufferings of Christ being thus insisted on, in order to his being a Successful Mediator with *GOD* for Sinners, He is therefore said to have *died for us*, and *for our Sins*. Our Sins render'd Suffering necessary: *GOD* thereupon insists on Suffering, without shedding of Blood He will allow no Remission: Hereupon Christ consents to die, and accordingly dies a Sacrifice for us, *bears our sins, carries our griefs, &c.*

Sect. 3. And this is that relation betwixt our Sins and the Sufferings of Christ, which is intended to be express'd by *Grotius*, and others, when they say, Our Sins were the *Meritorious Cause* of his Sufferings, i. e. they deserv'd Death, and

and so bound us over to it, as that we
 cou'd not be exempted from it, without
 a Satisfaction, without some-what Equi-
 valent to our dying; in which Exigency
 Christ dies for us. I cannot find that
 they (or, which with every Christian
 surely shou'd yet be of greater weight,
 that the Scriptures themselves) do mean
 any thing more. Thus Grotius, *Causa*
altera, quæ Deum movit sunt peccata no-
stra pænam commerentia. He does
 not mean that they deserv'd Christ
 shou'd be punished; but they so bound
 us over to Punishment, that unless Christ
 die for 'em, we cou'd not *Salva Divinae*
Iustitiæ demonstratione, a pæna mortis
æternæ liberari, as he had a few Lines
 before expressed himself. And there-
 fore having mention'd that Text a few
 Pages forward, Gal. 2. 21. *If righteous-*
ness be by the law, then Christ died in vain,
without a cause, he adds, *Locus ipse Pauli,*
de quo agimus, aliam (quam anteceden-
tem) causam intelligi non patitur—— And
 a little further adds; *Causam propriam,*
cur se tradiderit Christus, mortuusq; sit,
hanc esse, quod nos per legem justî non esse-
mus, sed rei pænæ; nostra ergo causa
est antecedens mortis Christi. To ^{cap. 1. p.}
 which he adds, p. 36. *Non potest alicu-*
jus actionis causa impellens esse Meritoria,
nisi

nisi & finis sit tñ artransire. And cap.
 3. P. 113, 114. *Aderebantur peccata no-*
stra ut pena exigeretur: quod vero pena in
Christum collata fuerit, hoc ita ad Dei &
Christi voluntatem referimus, ut ea quoque
voluntas causas suas habeat, non in Merito
Christi (qui peccatum cum non nosset, a Deo
peccatum factus est) sed in summa Christi
aptitudine ad statuendum insigne exem-
plum, &c. So that whoever allows, that
 our Sins deserv'd Punishment, and so
 bound us over to Eternal Death, as that
 we cou'd not be exempted from it, with
 safety to the Divine Justice, unless Satis-
 faction be made; that Christ died for
 this end, by satisfying Divine Justice to
 procure our Remission; and that his
 Death therefore was antecedently thus
 caused by our Sin, and was inflicted for
 an example, to deterr us from Sin; I
 say, whoever agrees to this (so far as I
 can find) admits of all that Grotius ever
 design'd, when he calls our Sins the me-
 ritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings. And
 so also the Bishop of Worcester; "Our
 Discourse " Sins, as an Impulsive Cause, are to be
 of Christ's " consider'd, as they are so displeasing
 Suff.p.69, " to GOD; that it was necessary for
 " the Vindication of his Honour, and
 " the deterring the World from Sin,
 " that no less a Sacrifice of Atonement
 shou'd

" shou'd be offer'd, than the Blood of
 " the Son of G O D.

Sect. 6. And to all this we do readily agree; yea, how fully has Mr. Baxter spoken to this Sense, particularly in his *Reasons of the Christian Religion*, Part I, Cap. 15. Sect. 9. P. 161, 162, 163. So also Part II. c. 4. §. 6. P. 232. and c. 5. §. 10. P. 253, 254. The Passages are too large to Transcribe. But he has there very plainly intimated, That G O D neither has, nor cou'd Pardon Sinners without such a Sacrifice, or substitute means, as might preserve the Honour of his Law and Government, and the future Innocency of his Subjects, as well as their Punishment in the full Sense of the Law wou'd have done.

Sect. 7. Now when the whole Matter or Thing is agreed to, all that the *Orthodox* intend by that Phrase, 'tis a very insipid thing for any one vehemently to contend what Word or Name to call it by: What if one call our Sins the *Meritorious Cause*, another the *Pro-meritorious Cause*, another the *Occasion* of Christ's Sufferings; whilst they are all agreed as to the Reference they had to 'em: But if any one by a *Meritorious Cause*

Cause intend more than what is above-said, or by an *Occasion* intend less; it may with just Reason be concluded, they are mistaken with the *Antinomians* in the one, or with the *Socinians* in the other Extream.

Sect. 8. We blame no one therefore meerly for calling our Sins the *Meritorious Cause* of Christ's Sufferings; nay, Mr. Baxter himself sometimes calls 'em so, the *Meritorious, or Pro-meritorious Cause*. *Confession of Faith*, p. 153. the Remote, or assum'd Cause. *Life of Faith*, p. 311. and p. 321. he allows, that our sins lay on Christ as the assum'd Meritorious cause of his Sufferings. So in his *Methodus Theologiae*—*Ad peccatum Relationem habent* (speaking of the Sufferings of Christ) *ut ad occasionem, & ut ad causam meritoriam remotam, & si non proximam*. P. III. c. 1. Determ. 5. p. 38. And in that other Book to which our Accuser refers us, he thus expresses his Sense, at his very entring upon this Point? "When He (Christ) is said to die [for our Sins] it may be understood ——" "for our Sins as the *Pro-meritorious procuring Cause* of his Suffering, through his own Undertaking to bear what they deserv'd: Or, if any think it "fitter

“ fitter to call ’em the Occasion, than
 “ the *Meritorious Cause*, they may. *Universal Redempt.* p. 5. And the very
 last Words that I have observ’d him to
 use of this Matter (in that last-men-
 tion’d Tract) are these: “ The strict-
 “ est Sense in which He (Christ) is
 “ said to die for Men, is, to die in their
 “ *stead*; or to die for their Sins as the
 “ *Procuring Cause*, on his own Under-
 “ taking: yield this once, and we shall
 “ much easier agree, &c. *Ibid.* p. 91.
 Which Two Passages do so inclose and
 explicate all the rest, that for a Person
 to represent any of the intermediate
 Passages to a differing and disadvantageous
 Sense, is what deserves a Censure so se-
 vere, as we did not think fit to ex-
 press, otherwise than by a significant Si-
 lence.

Sect. 9. But though we allow others
 their Liberty, yet (accurately speaking)
 it must be said, That all that Reference
 that our Sins had to the Sufferings of
 Christ, does not amount to a *Proper Me-*
ritorious Cause: Nor did *Grotius* ever
 think it did; whatever our Accuser may
 imagine; For though he does affirm (as
 is intimated, *Appeal*, p. 6.) that *Præter*
Dei & Christi voluntatem, datur Causa
Ante-

Antecedens Legitima mortis Christi: yet he distinguishes once and again, betwixt Punishment taken Personally, and taken Impersonally: By Punishment taken Personally, he intends the Sufferings of Christ, consider'd as his; by Punishment taken Impersonally, he means the Sufferings of Christ consider'd only as Sufferings: And he expressly tells us, That our Sins were only the Meritorious Cause of the Sufferings of Christ in this latter Sense. For thus he speaks, *Illud quoq; reprehensione indiget quod dicit Socinus, Præter Dei, & ipsius Christi voluntatem non posse ullam legitimam Causam reddi mortis Christi, nisi dicamus Christum meritum fuisse ut moreretur: Nam inest quidem in antecedente Causa meritum, ut supra diximus, sed Impersonaliter; merebantur enim peccata nostra ut pœna exigeretur, &c.* Cap. 5. p. 113. Our Sins only did deserve Sufferings, and those of such a value, and cou'd not be remitted, unless such a Compensation was made to Divine Justice for 'em; but they never did deserve that Christ should die; they made it necessary, supposing we be Redeem'd, that it be by such a Price; but they did not deserve that we shou'd be Redeem'd with his Precious Blood: All that *Grotius* asserts is, That Death was deserv'd, he no where says that Christ's Death was so. §. 10.

§. 10. And this is the true Reason why we are not fond of the Phrase [*a Meritorious Cause*] because it wou'd intimate, *Christ's Sufferings were deserv'd*. Now if they were deserv'd, it must either be allow'd, that they were the very thing that the Law threatned, or we (by our Sins) deserv'd God shou'd Save and Ransom us by such Sufferings. If either of these be true, our Sins may then be said to be the Meritorious, the *proper meritorious Cause* of Christ's Sufferings, as our Accuser wou'd have 'em; but cannot be strictly and truly so, otherwise than upon the one, or the other of these Principles. In that they deserv'd such Sufferings for weight, and cou'd not be remitted without such Sufferings, and Christ hereupon consented to suffer for 'em, they may be call'd the *Meritorious Cause* of his Sufferings, or, much more fitly, the *ground*, the *reason*, the *assum'd cause*, the *pro-meritorious*, or *quasi-meritorious Cause* of his Sufferings: But the real, *proper meritorious Cause* of 'em they cou'd not be, unless they in a strict and proper Sense *deserv'd that Christ shou'd die*. Now the Death of Christ is considerable under a two-fold Notion, either as a Curse or Blessing. As inflicted upon Him, 'twas a most *dreadful Curse*: As it was our Ransom, the Price of our Redemption, it was and

is

is a most *invaluable Blessing*. If our Sins therefore deserv'd the Death of Christ, it must be either in the one, or the other of these Respects: But no one surely will dare to say, That our *Sins deserv'd such a Ransom*; that GOD in giving his Son to be the Saviour of the World, gave us no more than we deserv'd; this were egregious Blasphemy, against the brightest and most amazing *Instance of Love*, with which God ever bless'd the World.

§. 11. It remains then, that (supposing our Sins the Proper Meritorious Cause of Christ's death) they did *deserve it as a Curse to be inflicted upon Him*, tho' not as a Blessing influential upon us. And 'tis not conceivable how our Sins cou'd so deserve the death of Christ, unless this be suppos'd to be *the very thing threatned in the Law*; [*if thou sinnest, Christ shall die*]: And this our Accuser sometimes seems to intend; what else can he possibly mean, when he tells us, *Appeal*, p. 25. *If Christ's Obligation to suffer did not result from this Law* (i. e. the Law which we had violated) *our Sins were not the Impulsive Cause of his Sufferings*: Or, if it did not immediately, *our Sins were but the Remote Cause, or Occasion*; not a meer *Impulsive, or Proper Meritorious Cause of 'em*. And p. 30. *If Christ's Sufferings be not ex obligatione Legis* (we suppose he means the same

same Law as before) *our Sins cannot be their Meritorious Cause.* And p. 41. *Whence its impossible (i. e. if Christ's Sufferings arise not from the violated Law, but from the Mediatorial Law, its impossible) Sin shou'd be their Meritorious Cause.* So that his Sense shou'd be, That Christ's Sufferings were not, could not be, 'twere impossible they shou'd be from our Sins, as the *Proper Meritorious Cause*, unless they did result, and immediately result from the violated Law. And this is what we also say; and therefore while he pleads for our Sins being so properly, so immediately, the Meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings; he must needs mean, that they did result, immediately result from the Law when violated; i. e. so soon as ever the Law was violated, so soon as we had sinn'd, the Law immediately lays hold on Christ, binds Him over to Death; and that it cou'd not do, unless he was threatned by it.

Here therefore I wou'd have manifested that the Death of Christ was not threatned by that Law, but that I have already largely done it, both in the *first* and *third* Chapters of this Discourse: And our Actuser himself has render'd it the less needful, by giving us as his true Sense, *That when the Law was, at first given*

to Adam, *Christ was not in the Obligation: it did not run [Thou, or thy Surety for thee]* p. 5. of this very *Appeal*. We shall therefore (instead of perusing the Matter further) allow him leisure to bethink himself how these things will be made to consist together, That *Christ's Obligation to suffer did immediately result from the Law*, and that yet *the Law did not include a Surety: Humanity it self (and much more Christianity) obliging us to shew some pity, and not to press too hard a Person that labours under the hardships of Self-contradiction.*

§. 12. To sum up this Head then, Orthodoxy does not consist in Words and Phrases; 'twould be egregious weakness to imagine, That the Controversies betwixt us and the Socinians are only whether this, or the other Word, or Form of Speaking, be most apt and expressive of that Truth about which there is no difference. That which the Bishop of Worcester has observ'd, with a more particular respect to a *Change of Persons*, will admit a much more extensive Application. "It is not (says he) the use of the Words, but the Sense of 'em is to be enquir'd into. See his Lordship's *Letter to Mr. W.* inserted in the *Answer to the Report*, p. 57. 'Tis not the bare Word [*Trinity*] that divides betwixt them and us in that point,
or

or the term [*Person*] or [*Satisfaction*] or [*meritorious Cause*] &c. But 'tis the Sense design'd to be express'd by those Terms, in which they will not agree with us; wou'd they allow the Truth we plead for, that is wont to be express'd by those Words; they wou'd no longer be *Soci-
mians*; nor wou'd any wise Man perpetuate the Contention with 'em, tho' they shou'd yet be unsatisfy'd as to the fore-
mention'd Phrases.

Our Accuser therefore does not (to use that Right Reverend Persons Words again) *discover his profound Knowledge in these Matters, if he think, as he says, Ap. p. 39. That the Heart of the Controversie lies in Asserting or Denying our Sins to be the Properly Meritorious Cause of Chrill's Sufferings: And if He know otherwise, and to design to impose upon those that do not, where is his Ingenuity.* 'Tis so far from being true, that the Heart of the Controversie lies here, that so far as I have yet observ'd, this very Man is the first that ever asserted, Our Sins were the *Properly meritorious Cause, &c.* *Grotius, Vossius, and the Bishop of Worcester,* do indeed speak of 'em as the Meritorious Cause; but how they explain themselves we have before manifested as to two of 'em. Nor does *Vossius* intend any

I 2

thing

thing more, than only that they are truly Meritorious of Sufferings, that they cou'd not be remitted without 'em; and that in this Exigency, Christ consents to suffer for us; whereupon he calls 'em the Meritorious Cause of his Sufferings; though he (as *Grotius*) means it only of the Sufferings he underwent, not of those Sufferings as undergone by Him. To this purpose we find him explaining himself; *Punitio omnis qua talis, sive Impersonaliter spectata, causam remissionis habet Justitiam Dei etiam utriusque* Procatartica vero causa sunt peccata, itidem Impersonaliter, & in genere spectata, sine determinatione, &c. Punitio vero, qua pro alio, est, plane misericordiae Divinae opus est: procatartica vero causa sunt peccata nostra Satisfactionem Exigentia. *Vossii Responsum ad Judicium Ravensperg.* Cap. 12. So that though they call 'em the Meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings, yet they plainly manifest, that they intend only they were meritorious of the Sufferings He underwent (abstractly consider'd) and therefore may improperly be said to be meritorious of his Sufferings; but I no where find 'em asserting our sins to be the properly meritorious Cause of Christ's Sufferings, much less fixing that as the Point in Controversie betwixt the Orthodox and

and the Socinians, whether they be to be so call'd, or not.

Nay, 'tis not only *not needful* to use the Phrase our Accuser wou'd impose upon us, but (unless carefully explain'd) 'tis *very unsafe*; for that if the Words be taken as they sound, they wou'd import that (in a strict and proper sense) *Our sins deserv'd that Christ shou'd die*: an Assertion, that in a sense very obvious does amount to *blasphemy*, and (without a manifest force put upon the Words) cannot possibly be a Truth.

CHAP. V.

That though Christ's Sufferings may not unaptly be call'd a Punishment, yet not in the full and proper Sense in which the Sufferings of the Sinner himself might have been so call'd.

§. 1. **I**N this Point also, our Accuser is as Clamorous, as in the former; and what has been said in the fore-going Chapter will furnish out a just Answer to all his Cavils upon this Head. He represents us, as if we did allow the Sufferings of Christ to be the Punishment of Sin, only so far, and in the same Sense as *Crellius* does, *Appeal*, p. 27. but deny'd 'em to be a *Proper Punishment*; and that therefore we are against the Doctrine of *Christ's Satisfaction*, *Ap.* p. 4. 10. And lest this shou'd not be enough to leave us under the Reproach of *Socinianism*, he represents this as the very parting Point betwixt the Orthodox and the Socinians; the *Heart of the Controversie* (according to him) lies in the *Asserting or Denying* — *Christ's Sufferings to be properly Penal*, p. 39. and (if he be not mistaken) *Grotius*, *Vossius*, and the *B. of Worcester*, are of the same mind.

§. 2. But after all, what if it should appear, That the Phrase is Ambiguous; that in one Sense (and which is plainly the Sense of that very Judicious and Learned Bishop, and others, that use the Phrase) it is true, *That the Sufferings of Christ are a Proper Punishment*; and yet in another Sense (which shall appear to be the Sense of Mr. Baxter, and those whose Sentiments agree with his in this Matter) it is as true, *That Christ's Sufferings are not a Proper Punishment, but Analogically only to be so call'd*: That the Bishop never own'd it, nor any Person of note, in the Sense in which we deny it; and that we do not, Mr. Baxter never did deny it, in the Sense in which the Bishop, (and other Famous Defenders of the Catholick Faith against Socinianism) Assert and Plead for it.

§. 3. To Evince this, there needs nothing more than a Just Representation of their Sense; what the one and the other intend by a *Proper Punishment*, and this they themselves were best able to express: Now then to constitute a *Proper Punishment* in the Bishop's Sense, there is no more needful, than that there be Sufferings inflicted on the account of Sin, to deter Men from Sinning, and to assert GOD's Rights as a Sovereign, and vindicate his Honour to the World:

Whatsoever Sufferings do answer all these Discour. of ends of Divine Punishments, and are inflicted the Suff. of on the account of sin, have the proper notion of Christ. P. Punishments in 'em. And again, Whatever is inflicted on the account of sin, and with a design to shew God's severity against it, and thereby to deter others from the practice of it, has the proper notion of Punishment in it.

59.
ib. p. 73.

This is plainly the Sense of that Right Reverend Person, he means no more when he calls the Sufferings of Christ a proper Punishment, than what is abovesaid. And to all this we cheerfully consent.

§. 4. But Mr. Baxter, when he denies the Sufferings of Christ to have been a proper Punishment, 'tis plain, he takes Punishment in the strictest Sense, as it does connote the suffering Person to have sinned; and intends no more by it than that Christ was not himself a sinner. Pæna in sensu primo & famosissimo est Ipsius Delinquentis malum naturale.— concludendum

Metb. The.

P.III. c.1,

determ. 5.

p. 38.

est. Christus non fuit revera peccator; ideoq; pænam sensu primo & famosissimo sic dictam non dedit. And this is no more than what every one must agree to; that supposing it be taken into the Notion of Punishment, that the Suffering be inflicted upon one that has sinned, Christ's Sufferings were not a proper Punishment. Nor was Mr. Baxter the only Person that apprehended this to be the most strict and proper

proper Notion of Punishment, the Learned *Pufendorf* (after *Grotius*, and other *Civilians*) does upon this very Principle assert, That however one Man may suffer, yet he cannot (properly speaking) be punish'd for another's Sin.

Pæna vocari nequit dolor ille aut damnum, qui in illos redundat, qui nihil deliquerunt— *Pufendorf, Element. Jurisp. Univers. Lib. 1. def. 21. §. 7. p. 237.*

qui in altero pænæ rationem habiturus est dolor aut damnum, delictum proprium tanquam causam respicere debet. Unde Pæna non est dolor ille, quem quis ex pæna propinqui aut amici sui capit, nisi ipse fors ad istius delictum concurrerit, &c.

To the same purpose he also speaks in his larger Tract; *Illos quidem, qui revera de reatu delicti participant, pro ratione influxus ad facinus aliquod puniri posse, extra dubium est; cum iidem non alienum, sed proprium delictum luant.*

De Jure Naturæ & Gent. Lib. VIII. c. 3. §. 28. p. 831.

But §. 30. p. 834. he adds, *De cætero firmum manet istud, in foro humano, ob delictum alienum, de quo nulla ratione quis participavit, recte aliquem puniri non posse, &c.*

And the Famous Dr. *Ames* includes it expressly in the Notion of Punishment, not only that it be some Evil inflicted for or on the account of Sin, but also that it be inflicted upon the Sinner himself. *Pæna est malum Peccatori propter peccatum inflictum.* *Amesii Medulla Theol. Lib. 1.*

c. 12. §. 10. p. (mibi) 56. And therefore he adds, §. 14. *Pena igitur propria dicta non habet locum, nisi in Creaturis intelligentibus, in quibus etiam peccatum reperitur.*

§. 5. This therefore is the only Question that can lie betwixt us and our Accuser, Whether Christ was *really* a Sinner, or not? If not (which we hope our Accuser himself will not scruple to say with us) then his Sufferings were not a *Punishment*, in that most full and proper Sense, in which the Sufferings inflicted on *Sinners themselves* are so call'd. We willingly allow, That they were as *properly Punishments*, as it was possible the Sufferings of one, who was himself no Sinner, cou'd be; but we dare not say, that Christ was a Sinner: And therefore, though He suffer'd for Sin, yet the Sin (since it was not his own) did not so nearly and immediately render Christ liable to Suffering, as it did the Sinner himself. Death was not due to Christ *immediately* upon our having sinn'd; the Law did not threaten Christ [if Men sin, thou shalt die]: After we had sinned, there was no one obnoxious to Suffering for it besides our selves, 'till Christ voluntarily undertook to suffer; he was not antecedently oblig'd, but

but (when he might have refus'd) he freely chose to die for us, *He gave Himself for our sins*, Gal. 1. 4. *He gave Himself a ransom for us*, 1 Tim. 2. 6.

§. 6. So that here is a vast difference betwixt the Sufferings of *Christ*, and the Sufferings of a *Sinner*. The *Sinner*, and *Christ* do indeed each suffer on the account of Sin, so far they agree; but the *Sinner* suffers for his own sin, *Christ* for the sins of others; the *Sinner* suffers deservedly, he *receives the due reward of his deeds*, Luk. 23. 41. but *Christ's* Sufferings were undeserv'd, he having done nothing amiss: The *Sinners* sufferings were threatned by the Law; but where do we find any threatning against *Christ*: The *Sinners* Sufferings are inflicted without and against his Consent; but *Christ's* were the matter of his free choice, what He might have refus'd, &c.

§. 7. Upon which, and other like grounds, how plain is it, That the Sufferings of *Christ* are not in all respects Commensurate to the Sufferings of *Sinners*; and that however they have such a respect to sin, on account whereof they may not unaptly be call'd *Punishments* (as Mr. Baxter himself asserts, *Method. Theol.* Part III. p. 38.) yet they have not altogether the same respect to Sin, as the *Sinners*

Sinners own Sufferings have, or would have had (as appears before) and therefore when we call 'em Punishments, we must not take so much into the Notion of *Punishment* as when we call the Sinners own Sufferings by that name.

§. 8. So that when the Sufferings of Christ are compar'd with those of Sinners, we say, they are less Properly and Analogically call'd Punishments not in that Primary and most Famous sense in which the Sinners own sufferings are so call'd: and yet when we compare the same sufferings with meer *Calamities*, that have no relation to Sin, or guilt; we say, they are not unaptly, but *properly enough* to be call'd *Punishments*, for that they had such a respect to Sin, as has been before-said. In this Mr. *Baxter* is plain: and therefore elsewhere Asserts, That his (*i. e.* Christs) sufferings were *truly Punishments* because for sin, though not for his own; yet *not Punishments*, in so full and strict a Sense as ours, who suffer for *our own sins*.

*Baxter. Two
Disputas.
of Original
Sin, p. 156.*

§. 9. And hence it appears, that our Accuser has with no just reason, represented Mr. *Baxter* as agreeing with *Crellius* in this matter. *Crellius* (says he) says the same, only with this Explication, *viz.* that it must be taken *materially* and

and *Improperly* which is the sense in which Mr. *Baxter* ——— takes it. *Appeal*, p. 27. But besides that Mr. *Baxter* (so far as yet appears) no where says, that the sufferings of Christ are Punishments *materially* only, (as this Accuser intimates) nay, on the contrary, he argues from their participating in the *formal Reason* of Punishment, that they may properly enough be so call'd, *Quoad nomen vero, non inepte poena dicuntur, dum ad Peccatum habent, relationem &c. Baxter ubi supra.* I say, besides this, any considering and unprejudic'd Reader will easily see, cannot but observe, that if at any time they happen both to use one and the same Term, they yet intend it in a vastly differing Sense. So if *Cressius* allow Christ's sufferings to be *Punishments improperly* so call'd; it is most evident he thereby excludes that respect they had to Sin, to our Sin, which we have in the fore-going Chapter asserted and clear'd, and in reference to which Mr. *Baxter* with the Bishop of *Worcester*, and all the Orthodox are agreed: and so also when he calls our Sins the *Occasion* of Christ's Sufferings, he means it not as Mr. *Baxter* does, of such an Occasion as was (so far as the Nature of the thing will admit) a meritorious Cause of 'em also.

And

And it may as well be said that *Crellius* says the same with *Grotius*, and the Bishop, because he sometimes calls our Sins the *Impulsive* cause of Christ's sufferings; and that his *sense* is the same with their's, because sometimes his words are so; and therefore also, that their sense is the same with his, and thereupon that they are *Socinians*: I say, there is the same Reason why they might also, as well as Mr. *Baxter*, be thus represented by our Accuser, for that they also sometimes use *Crellius's* words without any scruple.

S. 10. Nor is it any uncommon thing, for several Persons, to use the same words in differing senses: Our Accuser himself affords us a most convincing Instance to this purpose, in reference to the very matter before us. *The sufferings of Christ are to be consider'd as a Punishment of sin, a Proper Punishment.* In the Expression the Bishop of *Worcester*, and our Accuser are agreed; but that notwithstanding, the sense intended by the one, and the other is not the same. He pretends indeed p. 38. that it is *not the Words and Phrases*, but his Lordship's *sound sense*, that he contends for; but if that were all he would have, there was no occasion for him to contend at all; that

that having never (by those he Accuses) been call'd in Question: where he apprehended a difference betwixt his Lordship and Mr. *Baxter* at the most, it could be but a Verbal one, that their sense, when they explain themselves, does well agree, has been already manifested; and since Mr. *Baxter* did, and we do most Entirely agree, that *Christ's* sufferings were a *Proper Punishment*, according to the Notion his Lordship, gives us of such a Punishment, we may surely hope for an End of this Contention.

§. 11. Only for a Close, I would remark it to our Accuser, That whilst (either through Prejudice, or Inadvertency) he groundlessly charges us as differing from that Judicious and Right Reverend Person; he does himself give Occasion, for any one to return back the Charge, with greatest Justice, upon him. For under the pretence, That *Christ's* Sufferings were a *proper Punishment* (for which he alledges the Bishop of *Worcester*) he wou'd have 'em to be the *very Punishment* we had deserv'd, the *very Punishment* the Law threatned, *Punishment* inflicted by vertue of the Sanction of the violated Law. V. p. 23, 26, 28, 29, &c. This Notion almost runs throughout his *Appeal*. But this is
so

so far from being the *sound Sense*, in which his Lordship has us'd this Expression, that 'tis what he does most directly dispute against.

S. 12. And whereas he does once and again Insinuate, That 'tis necessary Christ's Sufferings should be truly and properly Penal (we must suppose he means it in his own, not in the Bishop's Sense) in Order to their being a proper *Satisfaction* to God's Justice for our Sins: 'tis (as has bin already, in some measure, manifested) utterly subversive of the True, and Universally own'd Doctrine of Christ's *Satisfaction*, to assert his sufferings to have been Penal, in any such Sense, as would inferr or include their having been inflicted by vertue of the violated Law, undergone in the proper Person of Sinners, their having been formally the same we were oblig'd to, and most immediately and properly deserv'd by our Sins; while yet this is what he every where pleads for: But of this Point of *Satisfaction* we design (God assisting) to treat more distinctly and at large hereafter.

F I N I S.